The Radical Reformation and the Making of Modern Europe

Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions

Edited by

Andrew Colin Gow (*Edmonton, Alberta*)

In cooperation with

Sara Beam (*Victoria, BC*)
Falk Eisermann (*Berlin*)
Berndt Hamm (*Erlangen*)
Johannes Heil (*Heidelberg*)
Martin Kaufhold (*Augsburg*)
Erik Kwakkel (*Leiden*)
Ute Lotz-Heumann (*Tucson, Arizona*)
Jürgen Miethke (*Heidelberg*)
Christopher Ocker (*San Anselmo and Berkeley, California*)

Founding Editor

Heiko A. Oberman †

VOLUME 207

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/smrt*

The Radical Reformation and the Making of Modern Europe

A Lasting Heritage

By

Mario Biagioni

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Adam and Eve Expelled from the Garden of Eden. Fresco, Museum Brancacci Chapel, Santa Maria del Carmine, Florence, Itay. Height 255 cm, dated around 1425. Artist: Masaccio (born Tommaso di ser Giovanni di Simone Guidi Cassai, 1401–1428).

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at http://catalog.loc.gov
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2016049396

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1573-4188
ISBN 978-90-04-33577-6 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-33578-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, ma 01923, usa. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Preface VII

1 A Broader Vision of the Radical Reformation: Some Historiographical Remarks 1
- 1.1 Bainton, Cantimori and "Eretici italiani del Cinquecento" 1
- 1.2 The Radical Reformation in the Historiography of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century 7
- 1.3 A Broader Vision of the Radical Reformation 17

2 Travelers of Utopia: The Other Europe of the Italian Exiles *religionis causa* 27
- 2.1 Travelers of Utopia 27
- 2.2 Parallel Escapes: Pietro Martire Vermigli and Bernardino Ochino 32
- 2.3 The Hard Choice of Fausto Sozzini 40
- 2.4 Francesco Pucci and the Realistic Utopia 48

3 Toleration and Adam's Immortality: An Example of the Relationship between Locke and the Socinians 57
- 3.1 The Immortality of Adam and the Breadth of the Kingdom of God in Locke's Writings 57
- 3.2 Adam, Locke and the Socinians 62
- 3.3 The Debate Between Fausto Sozzini and Francesco Pucci on Adam's Immortality 65
- 3.4 The Issue of Adam's Immortality in Socinian Thought After Fausto Sozzini 69
- 3.5 The Immortality of Adam, Salvation of Mankind and Toleration: Is there a Relationship? 72

4 Infinite Mercy and the Infinite Universe: Francesco Pucci and Giordano Bruno 76
- 4.1 The Infinite Amplitude of the Kingdom of God 76
- 4.2 Erasmian Affinities: Francesco Pucci and Giordano Bruno 83
- 4.3 A lasting heritage: A Brief History of Puccianism in the Seventeenth Century 93

5 Christian Francken and the Skepticism of the Sixteenth Century 108
5.1 The Descent of Christian Francken "in immensum" 108
5.2 Christian Francken and the Criterion of Truth 113
5.3 Christian Francken and the "Dispute between a Theologian and a Philosopher on the Uncertainty of Christian Religion" 117
5.4 Christian Francken and the Sixteenth-Century Origins of the Treatise "De tribus impostoribus" 126

6 Conclusions 135
6.1 The Radical Reformation and the Making of Modern Europe 135
6.2 Secularism 137
6.3 Toleration and Rationalism 139
6.4 The Break of Modernity 142

Bibliography 145
Index of Names 172

Preface

Some of the main principles of modern western civilization originated in theological controversies of the sixteenth century, such as the notion of toleration, the dignity of atheism, and the idea of otherness. Theological language was the most important medium of the intellectual debate: philosophy, medical science, astronomy, political thought, and so on were all connected with theology. The theological debate extended beyond universities, convents, and cathedrals. Nobles, bourgeois, and common people often spoke at home, at work and even in the streets about final salvation, the Trinity, the relationship between faith and work, and the holy supper. The introduction of printing allowed free thinkers, who didn't belong to any church, to spread their ideas throughout Europe. The borders between orthodoxy and heterodoxy were usually determined by disputations. Even commonly accepted ideas could quickly be considered heretical, and many orthodox theologians or intellectuals were soon regarded with suspicion (as were the works of Erasmus). So-called orthodoxy is the historical result, temporary and subject to change, of a long series of debates, struggles, and choices. Even more interesting to historians are these debates, struggles, and choices themselves.

Historians know that historical time is "continuous time" according to George Duby and, more recently, Jacques Le Goff (for example in his last book *Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches?* Editions du Seuil, 2014). All historians know, however, that historical time is the time of man, and is therefore marked by quick transformations and strong resistances. Every periodization implies an ideological choice. The aim of the historian is to rationalize the past by identifying the dynamics of transformations, paying the highest of respect to sources while focusing on his own research interests that are inevitably linked to the present. The historian is as much a part of history as the arguments he studies, and his interpretation of the past, though it is consistent, verifiable, and honest, cannot but be relative, partial, and subject to changes. A point of observation is essential in order to understand the sense of reconstruction and to express a critical judgment. If one changes the point of observation, the events appear in a different perspective, resulting in the discovery of new lines of research.

The Reformation is considered to be one of the key events in the history of Modern Europe. Its first and more evident impact can be seen in the breakdown of the unity within the Roman Church in Europe, and in the birth of new churches, generically termed "Protestant," which modified not only the religious framework of the continent, but also the social, political and cultural

ones. Today those churches provide tangible evidence of the Reformation; they are the final results of the long historical process that began at that time. However, the Lutheran, Calvinist and Anglican churches, plus minority groups that stemmed from Anabaptism and Unitarianism, represent only the most visible, institutional results of the great heritage of that extraordinary conflict of ideas. Many other religious options remained open for a long time during the sixteenth century, and were possible alternatives to the churches that were successful, at least until they were no longer historically feasible. The ideas and experiences linked to these unfulfilled possibilities penetrated equally into the religious, political, and social life of Early Modern Europe, as well as into theological debates; before doctrines had been fixed in dogmas and had become orthodox, yet were still significant, independent of their negative outcomes. The distinction between heterodoxy and orthodoxy is very important when addressing the history of churches and the historical reconstruction of the identity of a religious community, but becomes ambiguous in the history of ideas. It is important to know whether certain ideas were later considered orthodox or heterodox, yet, more important still, whether such ideas represented the expectations of the men of the time, whether they were real alternatives to the choices made later, or whether these ideas influenced the cultural debate and left a lasting heritage.

In 1699 Gottfried Arnold published *Unpartheyische Kirchen und Ketzer Historie* in Frankfurt am Main, wherein he claimed that the history of true Christianity was the history of "heretical" ideas (especially spiritualist ones). He simply exchanged the roles between orthodoxy and heterodoxy on the basis of his own religious beliefs; however, he demonstrated the possibility of a mirror image of history in which outcasts and losers became those who defended the true Gospel message. In short, Arnold wrote a history apart from the official one, presenting an antithetic point of view. It was a strongly ideological interpretation, and therefore weak in terms of historical reliability. Nevertheless, such an interpretation makes us think about the ecclesiological nature of the notions of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. The history of religious thought is not only the history of visible churches, just as the history of the Reformation is not only the history of the institutions that arose from it. From the churches' point of view, religious radicalism of the sixteenth century played a minor role without real autonomy, which is often regarded as subsidiary to that of the Magisterial Reformation. However, if we change our point of view and immerse ourselves in the center of those religious controversies—which now seem abstruse—with the aim of understanding which hopes, needs, and fears were under debate, we can find some key contributions to the rise of the modern European conscience in the struggles of those who later were defeated

and excluded. In this context the so-called heterodox thought was particularly fruitful, owing to the same critical force that often was the cause of its failure. The Radical Reformation left us a lasting and universal heritage of ideas that today, we feel, belong to everybody.

This book is the synthesis of twelve years of research, study and publications on the Radical Reformation. My first essay, *Nuove prospettive di ricerca su Francesco Pucci*, was published in 1995 in « Rivista Storica Italiana ». From then on, following the teaching of my first master Antonio Rotondò, I devoted myself to the study of the exiles *religionis causa*, especially Italians, who were not accepted by any church. Despite their marginalization, their ideas spread across much of Europe through their preaching but primarily due to the circulation of their books. Their thought influenced the cultural debate in the Early Modern Age. I support the theory that such ideas were more important than recent historiography on the Reformation seems to support.

The first five chapters of this book deal with different topics. The sixth chapter contains some final remarks. In the first chapter, *A broader vision of the Radical Reformation. Some historiographical remarks*, I deal with what seem to me to be the current limits and strengths of Italian historiographical tradition. The core of this topic is based on my brief remark, published by the journal « Bruniana & Campanelliana » in 2011, expressing doubt about the plausibility of the notion of the "heretic" in historical research, particularly in reference to the radical reformers of the sixteenth century. At that time I thought (and am now even more convinced) that such a notion was theoretically unsuitable and closely linked to an out-dated historiographical perspective. My doubts led me to study the issue in depth and to consider the characteristics and objectives of the main research on the Radical Reformation, concentrating my attention on the relationships between the historic Anglophone and Italian traditions. I have no intention of providing a complete picture of the historiographical perspectives; I want only to underline differences, contradictions and varying sensibilities (some of which conflict), with the aim of stimulating a reflection that I think may be useful.

The second chapter provides examples of stories of Italian exiles of the sixteenth century, linked by the topics of travel and utopia, as evidenced in the title: *Travelers of utopia: the other Europe of the Italian exiles* religionis causa. Travel meant knowledge and discovery, but in the minds of religious exiles it was also the only way to reach the countries they believed would accommodate their hopes of religious freedom and renaissance of true faith. Their destinations were Switzerland, Germany, England, and later Poland and Transylvania, yet their travels revealed a Europe very different from the one they had imagined. Their forerunner was Erasmus, but these pages deal with the vicissitudes

of Pietro Martire Vermigli, Bernardino Ochino, Fausto Sozzini, and Francesco Pucci throughout the sixteenth century, concentrating not only on the significance of their theological thought, but also on the human implications of their choices. They often left wealth, careers, and comfort in order to follow their beliefs in accordance with their ideals of a new and better world. Some were successful, while others were disappointed. In a few cases (Sozzini and Pucci) they freely and consciously chose uncertainty in place of certainty, looking at the future with an idealistic tension which today, perhaps, our society has lost.

The third chapter is titled *Toleration and Adam's immortality: An example of the relationship between Locke and the Socinians*. Locke's scholars know that many Socinian works were in his library, and everyone agrees that Socinian thought had an important influence on him. The aim of historical research is to determine more accurately in what way and to what extent they influenced him. This chapter provides an example. It traces the history of the debate about Adam's immortality from its origins (the dispute in 1578 between Francesco Pucci and Fausto Sozzini in Basel), through the developments in the Socinian tradition (especially with Johann Völkel, Johannes and Samuel Crell) to its presence in the *Reasonableness of Christianity* of John Locke. In 2003 I began to study the debate "de statu primi hominis ante lapsum," and subsequently the Socinian tradition, thanks to Lech Szczucki, who invited me a conference in Krakow entitled *Faustus Socinus and his heritage*. In the third chapter I focus on the consequences of this topic on some of the religious writings of John Locke, especially (but not only) *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. My aim is to prove the connections between the topic of Adam's immortality and Locke's thought on toleration.

In the fourth chapter—*Infinite mercy and the infinite universe: Francesco Pucci and Giordano Bruno*—I outline the parallel stories and travels of Francesco Pucci and Giordano Bruno around Europe, underlining some important affinities of their thought. They possibly met in Prague; they certainly met in Rome inside the prison of the Holy Office. In his last works, particularly the *Articuli centum et sexaginta adversus huius tempestatis mathematicos atque philosophos*, Bruno was influenced by the Erasmian idea of the infinite mercy of God (which was the main topic of Pucci's thought), and traces of Pucci latitudinarianism emerge in Bruno's language. They both believed in God's revelation through nature beyond the teaching of institutional churches. My conviction that there is a correspondence between some aspects of their thought dates back to the early years of the millennium. It was the topic of my lecture at the conference «Religione e politica in Erasmo da Rotterdam» that took place in Turin in November 2010 at the Fondazione Luigi Firpo. This lecture, with some variations, is the core of the second section of the chapter. In the first section I compare the idea of the infinite universe as a necessary consequence of its

infinite cause to the idea of the infinite amplitude of the reign of God as a consequence of his endless mercy. I try to demonstrate how these attempts to overcome a confessional vision of religious life had momentous effects on the thought on toleration in the sixteenth century. The chapter ends with a section devoted to a short account of the history of Puccianism in the seventeenth century. I think this is proof of the persistence of such ideas that had generally been rejected and considered heretical by contemporaries, yet have proved to be fruitful in the European history of ideas.

The fifth chapter, *Christian Francken and the skepticism of the sixteenth century*, provides a summary of some topics I have recently discussed in my work *Christian Francken e la crisi intellettuale della Riforma*. The protagonist is the Saxon exile *religionis causa* Christian Francken, who lived in the second half of the century. I focus on the topic of his path towards a radical skepticism very different from the Christian skepticism of Erasmus. The latter had never doubted the existence of God; the former, on the contrary, demolished every certainty, and showed the weakness of both revealed religion and the natural one. Francken reached this extreme conviction after searching for true religion in each Christian church. He was, in succession, a Lutheran, Jesuit, Calvinist, and a Socinian. His thought seems to have had something in common with the later tradition of libertines and Radical Enlightenment. In the last section of the chapter, I examine the hypothesis of possible relations between Francken's last writing, *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, and the origins of ideas which were collected in the infamous and mysterious book *De tribus impostoribus*.

It is very difficult to recall all those to whom I wish to acknowledge my gratitude over so many years. I have met many scholars who have given me advice or ideas for my research, and whose examples I have followed. I cannot forget Germana Ernst, who left us while this book was in preparation, Emanuela Scribano, and Lucia Felici, friends as well as esteemed colleagues. Without their encouragement to persist in my studies and their constant appreciation for my work in Italy, I might have long since abandoned my research. I owe this book to them. I am very grateful to Andrew Colin Gow, who believed in my proposal, and the anonymous reviewers, who appreciated my work and gave me useful suggestions. A special thanks to Benedetta Cappellini of the Royal Holloway University in London, and Matteo Duni of the Syracuse University in Florence, who have patiently helped me with the revisions of some parts of my English text. The major thanks go to my wife and sons, who tolerated my silences while I thought about this book, and have endured my absence while I worked on these pages.

Lastly, final greetings go to my father Giorgio, who died recently: I am indebted to him for my ability to dream and believe in utopias.

CHAPTER 1

A Broader Vision of the Radical Reformation: Some Historiographical Remarks

1.1 Bainton, Cantimori and "Eretici Italiani del Cinquecento"

In April 1932 Delio Cantimori, wishing to learn more about Roland Bainton's studies, wrote him for the first time.[1] The previous year Bainton had published an article on Sebastian Castellio,[2] which Cantimori had read and appreciated. Cantimori had been in Basel studying theology, but his interest in Italian heretics had already taken root, as evidenced by his essay on Bernardino Ochino published in Pisa in 1929.[3] A deep intellectual relationship rapidly developed between Cantimori and Bainton that lasted for over thirty years; it had a significant impact on their respective works, as they both recognized. In May 1932, Cantimori summed up his research project for Bainton in these words:[4] "My work will regard the heretical groups of Basel and Zurich: Castellione [...], Curione, Ochino, Lelio Socino, Fausto Socino and then Mino Celso, Jacopo Aconcio, Bernardino Bonifacio. I will especially try to show the substantial unity of their thought, the importance of Valla's exegesis for their ideas, and the radical change that they introduced into the religious life of the time with their exalted choice of spiritual freedom in discussing the problem of the essence of Christianity and of religion."[5] Bainton's interest in these free thinkers, who had focused on the problem of religious toleration in the Early Modern Age, came partly from his family background; in addition to himself, his brothers, father and grandfather were also Congregationalist ministers. Bainton's interest in Italian heretics paralleled his engagement in the defence of civil and political rights, which, over the course of his life, drove him to campaign on behalf of political refugees of the Spanish Civil war and victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution as well as against racial segregation, McCarthyism, American imperialism and the Vietnam war. Cantimori, however, discovered the subject in his philosophical studies taught by Giovanni

1 Tedeschi 2002, *The correspondence*, pp. 59–61.

2 Tedeschi 2002, *The correspondence*, p. 59.

3 Cantimori 1929, *Bernardino Ochino*.

4 The translation of this and subsequent quotations from Italian texts are mine.

5 Tedeschi 2002, *The correspondence*, pp. 62–63.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004335783_002

Gentile and Giuseppe Saitta. He felt the need to go beyond what he believed to be the traditional limit of nineteenth-century Italian culture and the division between clericalism and anticlericalism,[6] which he still encountered during his time. He wanted to reconstruct the history of ideas in its widest sense, to raise it above the suspicions of philosophers towards theology and of theologians towards philosophy.[7] He believed the point of contact between philosophy and theology to be in the philological rationalism of Italian humanism, which in his opinion was the distinctive common denominator in the thought of Italian exiles *religionis causa*. In *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento*, published in Florence in 1939, he argued that the Italian exiles had left their country in order to freely express their religious ideas, yet had not become integrated into any reformed church; nonetheless, they spread some of the main principles of humanistic culture across Europe.[8] Cantimori's book was the result of many years of research dating back to his youth, especially when he became acquainted with the concept of the "Civilization of Renaissance" advanced by Jacob Burckhardt.[9] A clear plan was fully expressed in his study on Ochino: the need for a new work about the "sons of Renaissance who, while joining at first the movement of the Reformation across the Alps, remained on its fringes and left it very soon. These heretics of all the Churches by force of their minds overcame the constraints that the Churches tried to place on reason."[10] His original research project, *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento*, was the history of a group of Italian exiles *religionis causa*, who exported their humanistic ideas abroad. Cantimori later modified it, but never changed it completely. As Antonio Rotondò writes, Cantimori considered the exiles "as carriers of ideas and demands specifically Italian, more than they really were."[11] This is made especially clear by his difficulty contextualizing their intellectual contribution to the wider European culture. The case of Francesco Pucci is particularly representative: while Cantimori pays a lot of attention to him, he does not situate his ideas within the context of the debate on the dogma of predestination, which had developed in reformed Switzerland and later in Lutheran Germany. In Cantimori's *Eretici italiani*, Pucci's main printed work,

6 Position of firm refusal towards every influence and every activity of the Roman Church in Italian political and civil affairs.

7 See the letter of Delio Cantimori to Roland Bainton, Basel, 21 May 1932 (Tedeschi 2002, *The correspondence*, pp. 61–62).

8 Tedeschi 2002, *The correspondence*, p. 15.

9 See: Prosperi 1992, *Introduzione*, p. XVII. The source is Miccoli 1970, *Delio Cantimori*, pp. 40–41 and *passim*.

10 Prosperi 1992, p. XVIII.

11 Rotondò 1993, *Alcune considerazioni*, p. 772.

De Christi servatoris efficacitate (Gouda, 1592), the most latitudinarian vision of mankind's salvation in the sixteenth century is depicted as an extraordinary but isolated book.[12]

Cantimori used the term "heretics" to describe Italian exiles, and scholars from his school continued to use it in subsequent years. Because he attached great importance to the unity of the Italian heretical movement, "Italian heretics" were regarded as a homogeneous group and became a well-defined topic of research, attributing an overall historical sense to their vastly different experiences in the various countries of Europe. This was an important novelty in comparison with previous historiography. Until that time, Italian "heretics of all the Churches" had awakened interest mostly because of their radical life choices and their battles in defence of freedom of conscience; in other words, they had been studied for ethical reasons with juridical implications. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Francesco Ruffini devoted a book to Italian exiles *religionis causa*, entitled *La libertà religiosa*.[13] Ruffini was an expert in law and an Italian politician (he was elected to the Senate in 1914 and later became Minister of Education). While he came from the Italian tradition of political liberalism, which was deeply anticlerical, he was a teacher of Canon Law. His research focused on the relation between Church and State in Italy and on the debate regarding religious freedom during the Reformation. Ruffini personally experienced the crisis of the Liberal State in Italy during the first postwar period; in fact, he retired from politics after the First World War, refused to take the obligatory oath of adherence to Fascism and was consequently removed from his university chair in 1931. Prior to Ruffini, an important contribution had been made by Cesare Cantù, an erudite man of letters, who had published the *Eretici d'Italia* (1865–1866)[14] which contained a good deal of information about many of the Italian exiles later studied by Cantimori. Cantù's Catholic and reactionary erudition, however, prevented him from dealing with the subject critically.

The new perspective introduced by Cantimori had a great significance in this cultural context. Above all, he wanted to open up new horizons and to overcome the narrowness of the Italian cultural debate, restrained by the "suspicions of the secular tradition towards theologians and the suspicions of the

12 Rotondò 1993, *Alcune considerazioni*, p. 773.

13 Ruffini 1928, *La libertà religiosa*. See also: Ruffini 1928, *Il giureconsulto chierese*. About Ruffini see: Quaglioni 2005, *A ciascuno il suo*.

14 Cantù 1865, *Eretici*.

religious tradition towards philosophers and, generally, laymen."[15] The term "heretic," however, with its ideological significance, seemed to establish a link to reciprocal "suspicions." It recalled the nineteenth-century anticlerical tradition, democratic and Mazzinian,[16] which had had a leading role in the history of Italian Risorgimento. On the one hand, the term "heretic" was used by the Catholic Church to accuse some of secularism; on the other it was considered by secularists to describe their anti-clericalism.[17] After the unification of Italy, the image of Giordano Bruno, the heretic *par excellence* and martyr of free thought, became the favorite symbol of the anticlerical tradition, as shown by the history of his statue, which was erected in June 1889 in Campo dei Fiori in Rome, not far from the Vatican, amidst fierce controversy.[18] The anti-clerical tradition was still alive in Italy, although differently, in the first postwar period and during the rise of Fascism. Adriano Prosperi emphasizes influences from the "reminiscences of Carduccianism[19] and of republicanism coming from the cultural traditions of Romagna"[20] being at the root of *Eretici italiani*.[21] At the same time, the definition of "heretic" belongs to the heritage of ecclesiology: it defines someone who abandons orthodoxy (good) and loses himself to sin (evil). Today, it can be used in reference to this particular group of exiles only because they were actually called heretics in their time, paying the price of marginalization, persecution and sometimes even death. By using this word, however, one runs the risk of perpetuating a distortion; that is, of projecting the perspective of their persecutors onto Italian expatriates. Even if neither

15 Tedeschi 2002, *The correspondence*, pp. 61–62. In Italy "religious tradition" meant Catholic tradition under the strict control of the Church of Rome.

16 Giuseppe Mazzini (1805–1872) was a leading figure of the revolutionary wing of the Risorgimento—that is, the nineteenth century movement for the Italian unification. Thereafter his thought influenced the republican movements in all of Europe. In Italy he also became the symbol of a revolutionary and anticlerical position.

17 The word is used to indicate free and anti-clerical thinking judged an "heresy" by Catholic morals, for example in the book of Pier Carlo Masini on the anarchism of the nineteenth century (Masini 1978, *Eresie*).

18 See: Bucciantini 2015, *Campo dei Fiori*.

19 The Italian poet Giosué Carducci (1835–1907) is considered one of the most important exponents of academic anticlericalism in the nineteenth century. In his poem *Inno a Satana* (1863), for example, he emphasized the use of reason, scientific progress, and free thought against the fanaticism of the Catholic Church.

20 Delio Cantimori was born in 1906 in Russi, a village of Emilia Romagna, an Italian region that boasts deep democratic and secular traditions.

21 Prosperi 1992, *Introduzione*, p. XVIII. On same political reactions to Cantimori's *Eretici*, see: Biasiori 2011, *Eretici*.

scholars nor the wider public today share the same damning judgment, the word "heretic" continues to convey other meanings, particularly a sense of isolation and exceptionality of the heretic's experience. Such tendency characterizes the works of Luigi Firpo, who, while making invaluable contributions to research on this topic, emphasized the extraordinary and sometimes picturesque traits of the Italian exiles, portrayed as unheeded and solitary travelers, especially Christian Francken and, partly, Francesco Pucci.[22]

Mauro Pesce, a scholar of the history of Christianity, has recently raised the issue of whether historians should use the word "heretic" at all. In an essay entitled *La relazione tra il concetto di eresia e la storia del Cristianesimo*, he argues that the concept of heresy did not exist in ancient Christianity. It was only in the second century that it began to be used to condemn a deviance in connection with the division between Christians and Jews. The early Church, in his opinion, had not followed a unitary model, as had been believed in the sixteenth century, but had constituted a plurality of groups, each different from the others in terms of customs and doctrines, which, only later, tended to join together. According to Pesce, however, the concepts of "heresy" and "heretic" are not applicable for theoretical reasons. He argues that the terms have an intrinsic confessional nature and a relative value, since they have always been used as tools "by a group, an authority or by an author towards other groups or persons" to condemn somebody or something, so cannot be used in the language of historical research.[23] In his opinion, this theory explains why the concept of heresy became so widespread in the theological controversies of the sixteenth century: a church used the terminology in an attempt to define its own identity and deny those of others. The idea of toleration began to take shape when the concept of heresy was called into question. This happened for the first time in *De arte dubitandi*[24] by Sebastian Castellio, who developed the Erasmian distinction between *adiafora* and *fundamentalia fidei*. He asserted that uncertainty in theological questions (e.g., the difference between orthodoxy and heresy) would be solved only by God's Last Judgment; therefore, peaceful coexistence among discordant opinions must be accepted until that time. It is necessary to situate the concept of heresy into a historical context so that its meaning is historically understandable. In this regard, Irena Backus

22 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*; Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*. His essays on the Reformation, published in various journals, are now collected in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*.

23 Pesce 2014, *La relazione*, p. 151.

24 The work remained in manuscript until the twentieth century. It was first printed by Cantimori/Feist in 1937, *Per la storia*, pp. 307–403. See: Castellio 1981, *De arte dubitandi* (containing also chapters VII–XIX, omitted in the previous edition).

emphasized that such a concept slowly lost strength between the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, and identified the conclusive step of this process in the work of Christian Thomasius, *Problema juridicum an haeresis sit crimen* (1697).[25]

Despite their common research interests, Roland Bainton did not agree with Cantimori on the use of the term "heretic." In *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, published in Boston in 1952, Bainton prefers to call these men "the free spirits of the Reformation." This difference is pointed out by Cantimori in his introduction to the Italian edition of the work (Turin 1958), where he writes that Bainton "calls here 'free spirits' those that someone scholastically has called 'heretics,'"[26] referring especially to himself. However, Bainton does not refer only to the "sons of Italian Renaissance" who had joined the Reform movement but kept aloof from its spirit while planting in it humanistic principles, as Cantimori believed; rather, he describes these "free spirits" as a European phenomenon, with followers in Germany, France, Spain, Italy, and Poland, whose roots lay not only in humanistic rationalism, but also in a widespread spiritualism, which devalued religious rites and dogmas. When the *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento* came out, Bainton had already published his first study about Castellio (New York, 1931) as well as his book on David Joris (in German, Leipzig, 1937). Books on Bernardino Ochino (in Italian, Florence, 1940) and Michael Servetus (Boston, 1953) came later, showing the breadth of his vision. Cantimori's original aim was to focus on the Italian contribution to the history of European thought, while Bainton wanted to reestablish the true historical sense and dignity of those groups or individual reformers, often radical and marginal yet united in their struggles for religious freedom. Luther and Calvin had treated them with contempt, the former referring to them as "schwärmer" (fanatics), the latter defining Servetus as a "ventosus nebulo" (fool charlatan).[27] Bainton's idea was thus not unlike the notion of Radical reformation, introduced later, even though Bainton insisted that he did not appreciate the expression.[28]

---

25 Among her studies see: Backus/Büttgen/Pouderon (eds.) 2012, *L'argument hérésiologique*; Backus/Goudriaan 2012: *Semipelagianism*.

26 Bainton 1958, *La Riforma Protestante*, p. 12.

27 Calvin 1667, *Brevis refutatio errorum*, p. 530.

28 Bainton always preferred the expression "Left Wing of the Reformation" because "Left" and "Right" had already been used by Luther. See: Bainton 1941, *The Left Wing*.

1.2 The Radical Reformation in the Historiography of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century

The expression "Radical Reformation" was introduced to the historiographical debate by George Huntston Williams in 1957,[29] and became the title of his most important work published five years later.[30] This topic, however, had already been studied by Alfred Hegler and Ernst Troeltsch[31] between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, as well as by Harold Stauffer Bender in the nineteen-thirties. Bender was a leading figure in the Mennonite Church. He strove to free the Anabaptists from the prejudices of the masters of Magisterial Reformation (Melanchthon and Bullinger in addition to Luther and Zwingli), who had considered them a group of rebels. On the occasion of the fiftieth meeting of the American Society of Church History in 1943, Bender affirmed: "There can be no question but that the great principles of freedom of conscience, separation of church and state and voluntarism in religion, so basic in American Protestantism and so essential in democracy, ultimately are derived from Anabaptists of the Reformation period."[32] The following year, while the Second World War was raging, he developed this subject in his well-known article *The Anabaptist Vision* published in the review "Church History". Bender reconstructed the religious and social thought of the Anabaptists, clearing it of prejudices that had accumulated over centuries. He suggested a vision of the Anabaptist world entirely founded on non-violence, the purity of the early Church and biblical literalism. Undoubtedly it was a partial vision, as it neglected the likes of Thomas Müntzer, who had resorted to violence, Balthasar Hubmaier, who had been reticent on relations between Christians and the civil authority, and Hans Denck and his Nicodemism. In this way, however, he not only restored the lost pride of his religious group, but also aroused a strong interest among non-Mennonite historians (Bainton, Hillerbrand, and Williams, among others) towards the radical reformers of the sixteenth century. His strenuous work and his dissemination and research in the "Mennonite Quarterly Review" succeeded in definitively changing the widespread image of the religious radicalism of the Early Modern Age, and radical thought ceased to be regarded as "a deformation of the Reformation," as it was

29 Williams/Mergal (eds.) 1957, *Spiritual and anabaptist*.

30 Williams 1962, *The Radical Reformation*.

31 Hegler 1892, *Geist und Schrift*; Troeltsch 1912, *Die Soziallehren*.

32 Roth 2002, *Recent Currents*, p. 523.

still being called by the Lutheran Johann Kurtz in 1885;[33] it assumed features of an important field of research in the context of studies on the Reformation.

Another pioneer of the renaissance of studies on the Radical Reformation in the United States was Earl Morse Wilbur, a Unitarian minister and historian at the Pacific Unitarian School. During his travels in Europe, especially in Poland and Transylvania in 1924–25 and 1931–32, he collected many documents on the origins of Socinianism, upon which he based his powerful *History of Unitarianism*, published in two volumes, *Socinianism and its antecedents* published in 1945, and *Transylvania, England and America to 1900* which came out in 1952. His work was the first global history of Unitarianism. Its wide scope also rendered it a general history of religious radicalism in the sixteenth century. George Huntston Williams carried out his research in the same context, beginning in the mid-nineteen-fifties. Like Bainton, he was a Congregationalist minister. Before becoming a professor at the Harvard Divinity School, he taught at the Pacific Unitarian School during the time Morse Wilbur was also there working on the history of Unitarianism. The first edition of Williams' *The Radical Reformation* came out in 1962 and was immediately acknowledged as the most complete work on the topic. Williams tried to make the historical picture drawn by Bender more inclusive, and wanted to give a theological classification to the world of free spirits, groups of dissidents, and reformer movements that appeared to be becoming increasingly lively and complex. He emphasized their importance and distinguished the Magisterial Reformation, which gave rise to the main Protestant churches, from the Radical Reformation, yet attributed the same dignity to both. Re-examining the historiographical tradition that had generically identified radicalism with Anabaptism, he divided radicalism into three categories: Anabaptists, spiritualists, and evangelical rationalists, including Socinians. Each group was further broken down in a powerful attempt to include the largest possible number of groups and personalities within one single, wide synopsis. The breadth and innumerable facets of theological debate which had developed outside of institutional churches obliged him to publish two enlarged editions in 1983 (in Spanish) and in 1992; the first edition had about 900 pages, the third more than 1,500. Williams demonstrated a broad knowledge of the primary printed sources and of the secondary works about personages and movements, as well as a profound understanding of theology. His work reflected the perspectives of groups such as Mennonites, Unitarians, Congregationalists, Hutterites, and so on, whose interests in the Reformation were also motivated by the desire to find the origins of their own religious traditions. This perhaps explains why

33 Roth 2002, *Recent Currents*, p. 525. See: Kurtz 1885, *Lehrbuch*, p. 148.

the classification of groups in a large synthesis is based essentially on theological criteria, which presuppose a doctrinal coherence; however, this type of approach has drawbacks. First, the religious and social movements never adhered to a strict theological orthodoxy, but rather were characterized by a complex mutability of ideas, and were open to contacts and reciprocal contaminations. Moreover, Williams' classificatory scheme does not work when the focus is placed on those who remained outside of the groups, or moved from one group to another. A few years after the first edition, some of the limitations of *The Radical Reformation* were underlined by Antonio Rotondò, who, coming from the school of Cantimori, remarked that Italian heretics had a marginal role in Williams' synopsis.[34] He argued that it was very difficult, or impossible, to trace well-defined boundaries based on clearly identified, stable theological principles, among movements which never became institutional churches. The need to define boundaries could not ignore "the travail preceding the formation of those boundaries, the frequent encounters among those men and movements, before and after the divisions and the reciprocal condemnations."[35] Any clear boundaries appeared to be inadequate, especially for reformers whose lives were characterized by changeability or free spiritedness such as Martin Borrhaus, Bernardino Ochino, Celio Secondo Curione, and Francesco Pucci, among others. It was not important to determine whether any of them were Anabaptist, spiritualist, or rationalist because the historical sense of their experiences resided in their inability to identify with a group or a church. If a scholars' goal is to reconstruct the historical and religious tradition of a church or even of a dissident movement, such individuals can be considered "heretics" of secondary importance and, perhaps, left in the margins. In my opinion, however, we must consider whether this point of view simply perpetuates the old condemnation from the heretics' opponents, and the marginalization that derived from it.

The most important objections to William's work were raised, in the last two decades of the twentieth century, by social historians, among them Hans Jürgen Goertz and Adolf Laube, who, while agreeing with the notion of Radical Reformation, rejected the predominantly theological perspective of Williams. They argued that, from a theoretical point of view, very often the theological doctrines of these reformers were not more radical than the first positions of the masters of the Magisterial Reformation. Goertz promoted the idea of a de-radicalization of the Reformation, which subsequently achieved

34 Rotondò 1966, *I movimenti*, pp. 103–139. But now see: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, pp. 1–43.

35 Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, p. 15.

widespread success.[36] The Reformation, in his opinion, had not begun moderately and then become radical; on the contrary, religious radicalism was the ground on which original revolutionary impulses had remained alive for a long time, especially strong anti-clericalism, in comparison with the process of re-clericalization in the Protestant churches.[37] His studies on Thomas Müntzer[38] not only called into question the model of an absolutely pacifist Anabaptism (such as Bender's thesis), they also pointed out the ineffectiveness of a merely intellectual interpretation of the Reformation. Goertz wrote that "seen in this way Radicalism cannot be measured by the criterion of rupture with the intellectual tradition of the immediate past, but only based on its break with present-day society".[39] This position was developed also by Marxist historian Adolf Laube, who discussed the problem according to a materialistic concept of history, and affirmed that radicalism of ideas must be measured on the basis of the facts which they produce: the strength of ideas has to be judged based on their actual effects on society. Even if Laube recognized the importance of the intellectual and theological side of the Reformation, he defined it as "a complex notion, which refers not only to Church and creed, but also to qualitative societal changes in social, ethical and political aspirations which accompanied the attack on the church".[40] Because he insisted that historians have to study intellectual transformations in a close connection with social ones, Laube expressed doubts regarding Williams' attempt to extend the horizons of the Radical Reformation to other European countries, abandoning a German-centric perspective. Only in the country of its origin, he argued, had the Reformation had radical consequences, which "resulted in a revolutionary upheaval or awakening".[41] This was a clear reference to the Peasants' War and to Thomas Müntzer who, in Laube's analysis, became the model of a radical reformer. The works of Goertz and Laube revived the historiographical debate on the meaning of the Radical Reformation, but at the same time they focused on two topics: the Anabaptist movement and the countries of central Europe.

The contributions of James Stayer were also of great importance. Beginning from *The Anabaptist and the Sword*, published in 1972,[42] he emphasized the variety of teachings concerning the principle of non-resistance and, subsequently,

36 Goertz 1987, *Pfaffenhass*.

37 See: Goertz 1995, *Antiklerikalismus*; Goertz 2007, *Radikalität*.

38 Goertz 1898, *Thomas Müntzer* (also in English: Goertz 1993, *Thomas Müntzer*).

39 Goertz 1982, *Profiles*, p. 21.

40 Laube 1988, *Radicalism*, p. 12.

41 Laube 1988, *Radicalism*, p. 14.

42 Stayer 1972, *Anabaptist*.

what should be the relations between Christian and civil authorities within radical movements. The book was followed by the well-known article on the origins of Anabaptism, *From Monogenesis to Polygenesis*, published in the "Mennonite Quarterly Review". Stayer argued that the movement was born from a plurality of groups. While Bender had focused on Grebel's circle in Zurich, Stayer suggested that the origins of Anabaptists might be found also among followers of Melchior Hoffmann in the Low Countries, or Hans Hut in Central Germany.[43] Like Goertz and Laube, Stayer denied that the notion of radicalism was based only on theological and intellectual criteria. He thought it wrong to extend the notion of the Radical Reformation over the whole of Europe, and to postpone its terminus *ad quem* until the early seventeenth century in order to include Unitarianism from Eastern Europe. By including a wider area, the definition could encompass countries in which the Reformation had not had radical effects on society, rendering the image of the Radical Reformation merely "an encyclopedia of certain types of religious and theological phenomena,"[44] according to Williams. In Stayer's opinion, the notion is consistent only if one excludes evangelical rationalism, focusing on central Europe during the period from 1521 to the end of the century. These differences reveal that the commonly accepted denomination of Radical Reformation is used as an umbrella term for historiographical concepts that only partially agree.[45] However, radicals that do not fit either in a classification based on groups and movements, such as Williams', or in the model based on the social effects of ideas, such as Laube's, are marginalized or even excluded: among them, of course, are the "Italian heretics."

A review of the main historiographical tendencies on the Radical Reformation was published in 2002 in "Church History" by John D. Roth, now editor of the "Mennonite Quarterly Review".[46] While rather short (thirteen pages), the essay aimed to give a comprehensive account of recent trends. In Roth's overview, the concept of Radical Reformation essentially returned to coincide with Anabaptism: the history and the historiography of Anabaptism thus became the history and the historiography of the Radical Reformation. Roth did not mention either Cantimori's heretics or Socinians, according to Stayer; however, this neglects several important historical traditions such as the Italian scholars associated with the teaching of Cantimori, and the important

43 Deppermann/Packull/Stayer 1975, *From Monogenesis*.

44 Stayer 1995, *The Radical Reformation*, p. 250.

45 A synthesis of the debate on the concept of Radical Reformation can be found in Hillerbrand 1988, *Radicalism*.

46 Roth 2002, *Recent currents*.

scholarly tradition initiated in Poland by masters such as Stanisław Kot and Leszek Kołakowski, which has produced many high-level students of religious dissent and Anti-trinitarianism in Eastern Europe. Mention must be made of the following: Ludwik Chmaj, author of the only comprehensive biography of Fausto Sozzini;[47] Lech Szczucki, the leading expert of Socinianism in Poland and author of fundamental studies on the main exponents of the movement (such as Fausto Sozzini, Jacob Palaeologus, Marcin Czechowic, and Christian Francken), as well as the editor of the monumental correspondence of Andreas Dudith;[48] Zbigniew Ogonowski, whose name is especially well-known for his research on the relationships between Socinianism and Enlightenment;[49] and Janusz Tazbir, interested above all in the relationships between Anti-trinitarianism and religious toleration.[50] The majority of their work has not been translated from the original Polish, an evident sign of the marginalization of these studies in comparison with those written in English. The same also applies to Italian studies on religious radicalism in the sixteenth century,[51] as well as other non-Anglophone traditions, such as Hungary's. This problem is increased by the fact that, while European scholars are generally able to read English, English and American scholars are seldom able to read Polish, Italian, or lesser-used languages. It is not surprising, then, that in the historiographical review on the Reformation in the early modern age edited in 2008 by David M. Whitford, *Reformation and Early Modern Europe*, the section devoted to "radicals" by Robert Emmet McLaughlin follows the same ideas suggested by Stayer. These are summarized in the opening words: "This essay will deal only with the Saxon Radicals (Karlstadt, Müntzer), the Radical Spiritualists and the Anabaptists. Unitarianism, Williams' third subset, is neglected here, as it is in most treatments of the Radical Reformation, because its geographical centers were outside of Germany and because the denial of Christ's divinity shifted its theological center of gravity outside the orbit of other Radicals."[52] This excludes all German and non-German reformers who were independent; that is, those who Bainton called "free spirits" and Cantimori "heretics." Whitford's

47 Chmaj 1963, *Faust Socyn*.

48 Among his several publications, here I only recall: Szczucki 1964, *Marcin Czechowic*; Szczucki 1972, *W Kręgu myślicieli*; Szczucki 1993, *Nonconformiści religijni*; Dudith 1992–, *Epistulae*.

49 Ogonowski 1966, *Socynianizm a oswiecenie*.

50 Tazbir 1967, *Państwo bez stosów* (now also in English: Tazbir 1973, *A State without Stakes*);Tazbir 1980, *Tradycje tolerancji*; Tazbir 1996, *Reformacja*.

51 An example of a chance meeting between the two schools is the Italo-Polish conference held in Florence in 1971. See: *Movimenti ereticali* 1974.

52 McLaughlin 2008, *Radicals*, pp. 82–83.

book came out more than twenty years after the similar bibliographical review on the Reformation edited by Steven Ozment,[53] to which it explicitly refers. As Whitford specifies in the preface, new tools and new studies have made necessary a thorough update, especially due to technological innovations and the large number of sources now available through the Internet.[54] But the novelty is not restricted to aspects of technology; in fact, the authors let us understand that new topics and significant changes have taken place in this field of research in American Universities. One of the first chapters of the review of Ozment, for example, was devoted to the connection between Humanism and Reform. Great care was devoted to the religious thought of Erasmus and to the so-called "religion of the humanists" in accordance with a perspective similar to that of Bainton and Cantimori.[55] In the book edited by Whitford, despite the very careful biography, there is no mention of Cantimorian scholars until Nicholas Terpstra's chapter devoted to the Reformation in Italy within the section on "Regional Trends," which alludes to some titles by Adriano Prosperi and Carlo Ginzburg.[56] Major updates concern "local religion" (Bologna, Florence, Venice), the religious turmoil inside the Roman Church, or transversal topics (i.e., the relationship between high and popular culture, women in the Reformation, etc.), and above all the connections between Catholicism and Judaism. The lack of references to research on Italian dissidents and exiles *religionis causa* is surprising, especially because several, important studies have been published in recent years. One could say that after having been excluded from the Radical Reformation, the Italian dissidents are not even considered significant for the Reformation in Italy, since they mostly lived outside their country and their ideas were discussed on the northern side of the Alps. Perhaps this is one reason why, among the studies of Adriano Prosperi, Whitford's collection does not mention the book devoted to Giorgio Siculo, one of the most enigmatic and fascinating figures of Italian radicalism.[57] The whole *Reformation and Early Modern Europe* volume, moreover, does not include any reference to studies on Valdesianism, and therefore there is no mention of the most important Italian

53 Ozment 1982, *Reformation Europe*.

54 Whitford (ed.) 2008, *Reformation*, pp. VII–X.

55 Tracy 1982, *Humanism*. The section on the *Religion of the Humanists* is from pp. 35–41. Among the authors in the bibliography at the end of the chapter, in addition to Delio Cantimori, are Antonio Rotondò, Domenico Caccamo, and Cesare Vasoli. Other sections of the book point out works by Adriano Prosperi, Carlo Ginzburg, Albano Biondi, and Paolo Simoncelli.

56 Terpstra 2008, *Italy*.

57 Prosperi 2000, *L'eresia*.

scholar on the topic, Massimo Firpo.[58] This is a serious omission, because the underground circulation of ideas coming from Valdesian spiritualism, which followed the practice of Nicodemism, is commonly considered by scholars to be one of the most notable Italian phenomena of the Age of the Reformation. One of Valdesianism's peculiarities was his avoidance of the use of printed media as a tool for spreading ideas; rather, ideas were disseminated through personal relationships and oral testimonies following personal connections stemming from the preaching of Juan de Valdés and, after his death, of followers such as Juan de Villafranca. The radicalism of some of the products of this underground circulation of ideas has recently been focused on by Luca Addante, who has demonstrated how a few figures from the circle of Valdés (Giovanni Laureto, Lorenzo Tizzano, Giulio Basalù, and Girolamo Busale) carried their free search of truth to the point of approaching other religions (Judaism and Islamism) in the hope of boundless irenics; that is, the union of all religions on the basis of a few *fundamentalia fidei* universally shared.[59] Their wanderings throughout Europe facilitated the dissemination of such ideas in other countries, as Addante argues in his latest works devoted respectively to Valentino Gentile and Giampaolo Alciati, both Anti-trinitarians.[60]

The neglect of Valdesianism is only one of the consequences stemming from the marginalization of Erasmus and of Erasmianism in this historiographical reconstruction. Similar considerations can be made about the penetration of Erasmianism into Spain: there is no discussion of it either in the chapter on the Radical Reformation, or in the chapter devoted to "Regional Trends." It is well known that many radical reformers owe their intellectual growth to Erasmus, starting with Michael Servetus, a true icon of religious radicalism, not only because of his tragic death at the stake in Geneva, but also because he is considered to be the founder of Anti-trinitarianism in the Modern Age. This is also the case of Juan de Valdés as well as other radical reformers belonging to the current of Spanish Erasmianism, such as members of the group that escaped from the abbey of San Isidoro del Campo, near Seville. These were Cassiodoro de Reina, Cipriano de Valera, and Antonio del Corro, who was in London and Oxford in the last quarter of the century and distinguished himself with his latitudinarianism and dogmatic indifferentism.[61] None of these figures, however, could be said to belong in the history of Anabaptism; none

58 See, for example: Valdés 1994, *Alfabeto*; Firpo 1990, *Tra alumbrados*; Firpo 1998, *Dal sacco*; Firpo 2016, *Juan de Valdès*. See also in English: Firpo 2015, *Juan de Valdés*.

59 Addante 2010, *Eretici*.

60 Addante 2013, *Giampaolo Alciati*; Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*.

61 A complete bibliography in: Kinder 1986, *Antonio del Corro*.

could be defined, strictly speaking, as spiritualist on a revolutionary or social level. In short, none fits into the historiographical parameters commonly used to define the Radical Reformation; thus, there is no trace of them in the book edited by Whitford. The difference from Bainton could not be more evident. Bainton was convinced that several key aspects of Erasmus' teachings were at the root of the movement of the "free spirits": religious scepticism, doubts about the Trinity, aversion to Scholastic subtleties and, generally, to Scholastic theology, placed Erasmus in a central position in the chapter he devoted to "free spirits" in *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*. For the same reason he wrote *Erasmus of Christendom* in 1969, whose title declares the importance of the religious reformer distancing his image from that of the pure humanist as portrayed by Johan Huizinga in 1924 in his famous biography.[62] Such an idea was shared by Delio Cantimori, who had built his own research hypothesis on the conviction that the thought of the Italian heretics had mainly humanistic roots. Not by chance was the Italian edition of Bainton's book on Erasmus, which came out in Italian right after its first publication (1970), introduced by Antonio Rotondò, a disciple of Cantimori. Rotondò emphasized the force of an intellectual connection, writing that "the monograph on Erasmus that Bainton has given us is closely connected with the research that he has carried out over a time of about fifty years on various figures and movements in the heretical world of the sixteenth century: from Castellio to Bernardino Ochino, to David Joris, to Servetus, to Postel [...] This monograph on Erasmus seems to be a remarkable result [...] of those fifty years of research on the history of the underground world of exiles and victims of persecution."[63]

One of the most interesting books in English about this topic is mentioned in the Whitford's guide to research in relation to the history of Anabaptism,[64] namely Abraham Friesen's *Erasmus, the Anabaptists and the Great Commission* published in 1998. Based on a careful study of documentary sources (some unpublished), Friesen argues for the Erasmian origin of the ideas that influenced the Anabaptist movement, both the Swiss groups and Menno Simons. He points out the similarities between the latter's concept of baptism and Erasmus' preface to the 1522 edition of the *Novum Testamentum*, the *Adnotationes*, especially his interpretation of *Mt.*, XXVIII, 18–20, the so-called "Great Commission." At odds with previous historiographical positions, Friesen clearly states that "not only is the Great Commission as interpreted by Erasmus the key to the problem of the intellectual origins of Anabaptism; it is also the

62 Huizinga 1924, *Erasmus*.

63 Bainton 1970, *Erasmo*, p. x.

64 Whitford (ed.) 2008, *Reformation*, pp. 107–108.

key to understanding the movement as a whole."[65] However, in the new millennium many other scholars have dealt with the relation between the thought of Erasmus and religious radicalism. Here I will mention only two works: the first, by Carlos Gilly, *Reforma radical y los heterodoxos radicales españoles* (2005), opens with a section unequivocally entitled "Erasmus master and inspirer of heretics";[66] the second, by Peter Bietenholz, *Encounters with a radical Erasmus* (2009), speaks plainly of a "Radical Erasmus," and in the subtitle defines his writings "as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe."[67] The interpretation suggested by Bietenholz also calls into question the notion of radicalism as outlined in the debate on Williams' book. Bietenholz has devoted his research to restless dissidents who kept outside of every established group, and thus cannot be defined on the basis of rigid distinctions between different movements. One example is Daniel Zwicker, who was simultaneously considered a Socinian, a Hutterita and a free spirit.[68] Bietenholz argues that, strictly speaking, Erasmus cannot be defined as a "radical" because he shunned the excesses of theological debate, preferred intellectual compromise, and held ambiguous positions on frequently debated issues. However, he formulated "a number of new concepts that were radical in the early modern period and some that still are radical."[69] Bietenholz leads the reader to "encounter" Erasmian ideas which emerged in different places and circumstances and that were often carried to their final consequences by the reformer's intellectual coherence in the religious and cultural debate of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Along the way we encounter some of the main religious dissidents of the time, such as Sebastian Franck, Michael Servetus, Lelio and Fausto Sozzini, Giulio Basalù, Celio Secondo Curione, Sebastian Castellio, Daniel de Breen, and Daniel Zwicker, but also major personalities from the broader cultural scene, such as Girolamo Cardano, Isaac Newton, John Locke, and John Milton; according to Bietenholz, the common denominator of many of their ideas is Erasmian source.

---

65 Friesen 1998, *Erasmus, the Anabaptists*, p. 98.

66 Gilly 2005, *Erasmo*.

67 Bietenholz 2009, *Encounters*. Bietenholz's book was published shortly after the bibliographic review of Whitford, but it draws on previously published research—journals and miscellanies—written between 2000 and 2007. See: Bietenholz, *How Sebastian* 2000; Bietenholz 2004, *Erasmus*; Bietenholz 2005, *Un guerriero*; Bietenholz 2005: *Fausto Sozzini*; Bietenholz 2007, *Felicitas*.

68 Bietenholz 1997, *Daniel Zwicker*. This book is mentioned in Whitford's review: Whitford (ed.) 2008: *Reformation*, p. 201.

69 Bietenholz 1997, *Daniel Zwicker*, p. 4.

1.3 A Broader Vision of the Radical Reformation

The majority of American historians who have studied the Reformation Age come from confessional groups that can trace their roots to the varied world of sixteenth-century radicalism. To them, the study of that age presents the opportunity to investigate the origins of their community identities. They are thus at risk of projecting current categorization onto the past, and of tracing demarcation lines which inevitably simplify the complex and uncertain reality of religious radicalism. Another factor that might complicate our understanding is the process of secularization that has reduced the importance of theological issues in contemporary western societies. While theological language is now largely technical jargon, in the sixteenth-century theological terms were commonly used and widely understood, and religious controversies were the grounds on which intellectuals debated topics that we now ascribe to very different fields of knowledge. Servetus dealt with the topic of pulmonary circulation in his theological work entitled *Christianismi restitutio*; Castellio based his defence of toleration on the idea of the progressiveness of divine revelation; Agostino Doni was obliged to flee Basel because local theologians strongly objected to his scientific theories; and Fausto Sozzini defended the principle of personal responsibility on the basis of the refusal of a natural revelation. Debate on religious issues was not restricted to theologians, but took place outside church gates and often beyond the gates of university halls. It engaged scientists, philosophers, men of letters, politicians, cultured upper-middle classmen, noblewomen, merchants, artisans, and the lower classes. The boundary between philosophy and theology was extremely tenuous. This problem has recently been discussed by Sarah Mortimer and John Robertson in the introduction to *The Intellectual Consequences of Religious Heterodoxy*; however, the two scholars proceed in the opposite direction, so to speak, since they argue that it is wrong to believe, as historians of political thought tend to do, that early instances of secularism and atheism arose in total opposition to religious thought. They agree with John Pocock that "enlightenment was a product of religious debate and not merely a rebellion against it,"[70] and they affirm that heterodox thought in the sixteenth century was an extraordinary intellectual laboratory that produced fundamental ideas that led to the birth of modern European civilization. In fact, the thoughts of men such as Hobbes, Spinoza, Vico, and Giannone can be misinterpreted if read hastily in secular terms, yet "can only be fully understood in this Christian, heterodox context."[71] However,

70 Pocock 1999, *Barbarism*, p. 5.

71 Mortimer/Robertson (eds.) 2012, *The intellectual consequences*, p. 39.

the history of ideas between the Reformation and Enlightenment has been renewed, especially by works such as Jonathan Israel's *Radical Enlightenment* and Martin Mulsow's *Moderne aus dem Untergrund*. The former argues that Spinoza is crucially important as regards the Radical Enlightenment and that his works are only intelligible in the context of the theological debates;[72] the latter emphasizes the close connection between theological thinking and philosophical thought in early Enlightenment Germany.[73] I think that the history of religious thought is the history of ideas from every point of view, at least until ideas are codified in theological dogmas; therefore ideas that did not become dogmas during the sixteenth century, or that were not included in the tradition of a visible church, should not be excluded from the history of religious thought since they often strongly influenced theological doctrines and dogmas. In some cases they survived, through subterranean itineraries and changing form, in the philosophical and political thought of later centuries. In my opinion, only a broad vision of religious radicalism in the sixteenth century will enable a more accurate understanding of its historical sense. Cantimori understood the need when he tried to widen the intellectual framework of the *Eretici Italiani del Cinquecento* by discussing relations between Italian heretics and the broader religious life in Europe. In one of his latest works, *Prospettive di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento* (1960),[74] Cantimori considers the heretical movement through a European lens, distinguishing between Anabaptism, Anti-trinitarianism, and various currents of spiritualism and Erasmianism, painting a picture not very different from the "Radical Reformation" proposed by Williams a few years later.[75] Some scholars of Cantimori continued working in the same direction, among them Antonio Rotondò, who, while still using the term "heretics," argued that their historical role lay not only in the exportation of principles of Italian humanism into the theological controversies of the Reformation, but also in creative responses to different religious and cultural contexts found in northern European countries. Rotondo's works provide a rich and complex reconstruction of the ideas of "heretics," how they were circulated and their progressive development through incessant exchange. In the end he suggests that "Italian heretics," despite a distinctive intellectual outlook, were "European heretics," and hence belonged to the Reformation. This idea was already clear in his first collection of essays, *Studi e ricerche di storia*

72 Israel 2002, *Radical Enlightenment*.

73 Mulsow (2002), *Moderne*. See also his studies on Socinianism in Europe, for example: Mulsow/Rohls (eds.) 2005, *Socinianism*.

74 Cantimori 1960, *Prospettive*. Now in: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 419–481.

75 Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 424–425.

ereticale italiana del Cinquecento (1970),[76] but it reached full maturity in his Lelio Sozzini edition,[77] where Rotondò reconstructed the personality of one of the founders of Socinianism through an in-depth analysis of his relations not only with magisterial reformers, particularly Calvin and Bullinger, but also with important figures of world culture and science such as Bonifacius Amerbach, Crato von Crafftheim, Konrad Pellikan, and Johannes Wolf. Most importantly, Rotondò provided a detailed study of the extremely valuable (though small) *corpus* of Sozzini's theological writings, including *Brevis explicatio in primum Iohannis caput*, one of the key texts of Anti-trinitarianism. In a broader vision of the Radical Reformation, the "heretics" (not only the Italian ones) should rightfully be included with other reformers who tried to realize widespread expectations of religious renewal at that time. The Italian exiles, *religionis causa*, regarded themselves exactly as the magisterial reformers did: they shared the responsibility of an epoch-making change in religious and social life, and radically applied the doctrine of the interpretation of Scripture on the basis of their own conscience (the so-called *sola scriptura*). The heretics were reformers without institutional authority, or reformers "without a church," to quote a well-known expression by Leszek Kołakowski;[78] however, they were no less keenly committed to proselytizing than major leaders, and to this end they took part in the theological debate, published books, and entered the world of universities.

One of the most extensive efforts to put a face to all those who were marginalized in the history of the Reformation stems from the publication of the *Bibliotheca Dissidentium*, initiated by André Séguenny of the Université de Strasbourg in 1980, and which has now reached the twenty-sixth volume. It is a series of publications, each devoted to one or more dissidents, with the aim of providing scholars with complete biographical and bibliographical tools. The series of profiles is not chronological: each has a thematic character and is placed within the general picture of religious dissent that was occurring in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Spaces created by broad historical overviews are slowly being filled by new findings, and a partially forgotten world is returning to light. Among the authors included in the *Bibliotheca Dissidentium* are many whom Cantimori studied. They are placed next to others who come from the Anabaptist, Unitarian or spiritualist traditions. The constantly increasing number of authors makes the definition of "heretics" more and more unsuitable, and the idea of isolation, of a solitary departure from

76 Rotondò 1974, *Studi e ricerche*. But now see: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*.

77 Sozzini 1986, *Opere*.

78 Kołakowski 1969, *Chrétiens sans Église*.

the truth, which the notion of heretic implies, less and less tenable. Adriano Prosperi's study on Giorgio Siculo and the "heresy of the great book,"[79] as well as Massimo Firpo's research on Valdesianism and on the inquisitorial trials of major Catholic Church figures such as Morone, Carnesecchi and Soranzo,[80] show how uncertain and tenuous the boundary was between orthodoxy and heresy even in Italy, that was supposed to be the stronghold of Catholicism. Above all, such studies confirm that the boundary had an ecclesiological nature and was thus, in a certain sense, a political boundary. They also show that even long-accepted ideas, beliefs and practices could quickly be deemed heretical. Silvana Seidel Menchi's research charts the wide circulation of the ideas of Erasmus all over Italy before his books were placed on the *Index* of forbidden books. She argues that they contributed decisively to the spread of the so-called theology "of the open heaven"; that is, the possibility of obtaining final salvation simply by virtue of one's own inner conviction of salvation. This theology had kindled great hopes, inducing many to believe it was widespread in churches beyond the Alps.[81] The case of the Piedmontese Celio Secondo Curione (1503–1569) is emblematic. Curione was one of the most Erasmian Italian exiles of the first generation.[82] He was attracted to the Reformed Church in Switzerland, and was protected by the head of the Zurich church, Heinrich Bullinger. After leaving Italy, he took refuge in Lausanne and then Basel, where he discovered that his firm belief in a universal predestination of all men to divine salvation was considered radical compared with the Calvinist doctrine of double predestination. When Michael Servetus was burned at the stake as a heretic in Geneva (1553), Curione reacted by publishing *De amplitudine beati regni Dei*, which was closely connected to Erasmus' *De magnitudine misericordiarum Domini* (1524).

Despite events such as this one, the image of a head-on collision between orthodox theologians and heretics does not reflect the fact that ideas were constantly changing, circulating widely across groups, movements, and individual thinkers. This problem was first raised in the early eighties by James Stayer in the context of the debate following the publication of Williams' *The Radical Reformation*,[83] and continues today in recently published works

79 Prosperi 2000, *L'eresia*.

80 Firpo/Marcatto (eds.) 1981–1995, *Il processo inquisitoriale*; Firpo/Marcatto (eds.) 1998, *I processi inquisitoriali*; Firpo 2005, *Inquisizione romana*; Firpo 2006, *Vittore Soranzo*.

81 Seidel Menchi 1987, *Erasmo*, pp. 143–167.

82 On this topic, see: D'Ascia 2003, *Frontiere*.

83 "His efforts to formulate theological distinctions between the Radical Reformation and the Magisterial Reformation tend to obscure the dialectical relationship between

concerning the Italian exiles *religionis causa*. These new studies show that most Italian exiles were familiar with the works of the magisterial reformers (above all Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin) while they were still in Italy.[84] Far from being totally averse to Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, the intellectual and theological outlook of most Italian "heretics" was shaped by their teachings, which were radicalized on the basis of their humanistic scholarship. Lucia Felici and I have sought to show the inconsistency of this rift in a textbook we recently published, *La Riforma radicale nell'Europa del Cinquecento*.[85] Our volume seeks to identify a balance point between Williams' synopsis (based on the vertical distinction among three great movements: Anabaptism, Spiritualism, and Evangelical rationalism) and the cross debate about key topics from the sixteenth century (baptism, authority of the Scriptures, universalism and toleration, and Trinitarian dogma). The first chapter examines the origins of religious radicalism, its medieval sources, the impact of humanistic philology and the teachings of Erasmus, but also some aspects of the ideas of the magisterial reformers, because we think that Italian radical thinkers belong entirely in the historical picture of the Reformation. We argue that the Magisterial and Radical Reformations are strongly connected despite their conflicting relationship, and we disagree with scholars who consider non-conformity to have been a mere deviance from orthodoxy or isolated forerunners of Deism. This type of approach, which has been adopted especially by historians with close ties to the reformed Church, usually downplays the contribution of religious radicalism; in some cases it is even considered to be Deism or another form of philosophical thought lying beyond the religious history of this century. Eminent scholars, such as Alain Dufour of Geneva and Emidio Campi of Zurich, tend on the one hand to underline that these dissidents played marginal roles in comparison to the weighty influence of the institutional Church, yet on the other hand emphasize their dependence on the orthodox tradition. They see dissidents as heretics in a literal sense: drifting, apart, and secluded. Alain Dufour has a key role in the edition of the *Correspondance* of Théodore de Bèze, currently in volume XXXVI:[86] his monumental scientific project, which provides scholars with information regarding one of the main figures of that time, including

---

the radicals and the major Reformers against whom they dissented" (Stayer 1982, *The Anabaptists*, p. 138).

84 See, for example: Rotondò 1962, *Per la storia*; Del Col 1978, *Lucio Paolo Rosello*; Cavazza 2006, *Bonomo, Vergerio, Trubar*; Peyronel Rambaldi 2007, *La Réforme*; Felici 2010, *Giovanni Calvino*; Cavazza 2013, *Libri luterani*.

85 Biagioni/Felici 2012, *La riforma radicale*.

86 Bèze 2012, *Correspondence. Tome XXXVI* (*1595*).

details of his historical background. However, Dufour's judgment of Francesco Pucci's *De praedestinatione Dei* (1589)[87] downplays the importance of the Florentine reformer (one of the main Italian exiles of the sixteenth century), affirming that Pucci "such as many others heretics of sixteenth century [...] is a mere forerunner of Deism, but he remains isolated in his time."[88] Pucci's work was part of a major debate on predestination that involved the churches of Switzerland (above all Bern and Lausanne) followed by the churches of Lutheran Germany (Tübingen and Wittenberg) owing to the preaching of the minister Samuel Huber and his *Theses Christum Iesum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum* (1590).[89] Dufour, far from acknowledging that this was a wide-ranging issue, simply repeats his point of view that these two figures "both are isolated. This does not change much the problem."[90] Such a historiographical perspective refuses to accept that the heretic movement had its own theological identity, and acknowledges the importance of some dissidents only in relation to their influence on the magisterial tradition. Emidio Campi, in a 1994 essay on the book of Massimo Firpo, *Riforma protestante ed eresie nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, said that the main weakness in Firpo's vision was his conviction regarding the theological identity and unity of the Italian heretical movement; the author, therefore, had overvalued the thoughts and choices of single men to the detriment of matters of true significance in the history of the Reformation.[91] Campi expressed this opinion within a broad and appropriate critique of the traditional view of a dichotomy between the Magisterial Reformation, supposedly inclined to dogmatization, and the Italian heretical movement, supposedly indifferent towards dogmas and characterized by a more practical and ethical approach to religion. The risk is studying radical thought only as a derivation of magisterial tradition, thus missing its peculiarity and watering down its intellectual identity. For example, commenting on Stefania Salvadori's book on Sebastian Castellio,[92] Campi wrote that one of the merits of the work is that it frees Castellio from "mythic-literary drifts," especially from Cantimori's judgment of Castellio as a champion of free thought against the authoritarianism of the Calvinist Church of Geneva.[93] Salvadori's work, however, while certainly valuable, reconstructs the sources of Castellio's

87 Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*.

88 « Bibliothéque d'Humanisme et Renaissance », LXIV, 2002, p. 179.

89 Adam 1970, *Der Streit*; Biagioni 1999, *Incontri italo-svizzeri*.

90 « Bibliothéque d'Humanisme et Renaissance », LXV, 2003, p. 524.

91 Firpo 1993, *Riforma protestante*; Campi 1994, *Remarques*.

92 Salvadori 2009, *Sebastiano Castellione*.

93 Salvadori 2009, *Sebastiano Castellione*, p. V.

book *De arte dubitandi*, privileging a quantitative analysis. This overemphasizes Calvin's influence and underrepresents Castellio's relations with the heterodox reformers of the Basel circle such as Curione, David Joris, Lelio and Fausto Sozzini, with the exception of Ochino, whose presence is considered crucial in terms of ideas.

The works of religious dissidents and their historical significance can be evaluated more accurately when examined within the general history of ideas, and not merely according to ecclesiological categories. In the recent edition of the debate between Francesco Pucci and Fausto Sozzini, *De statu primi hominis ante lapsum disputatio*,[94] which includes four texts on the immortal nature of Adam, I have intentionally avoided using the definition "heretics." In this work, more than in other theological controversies of the time, the breadth of the topics defies confessional boundaries. The two exiles discuss issues ranging from the mortality of the soul to the magnificence of the human body, from the ethical question of the individual's responsibility to the souls of animals and of their sufferings.[95]

While churches and institutions were certainly among the places in which religious debate took place, they were not the only places. It is clear that any strictly confessional point of view can only interfere with an accurate comprehension of the debate, which is why its significance has been better captured by research belonging to the broader history of ideas, especially in the last decades. Following the pioneering works of Richard Henry Popkin and Charles Bernard Schmitt,[96] the field of the history of skepticism and atheism between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has been extremely prolific in terms of research on religious radicalism. It is also due to European and American scholars collaborating on joint projects. One of the first and most important collections of essays on this topic was *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, edited in the 1990s by Michael Hunter and David Wootton.[97] A few years later came *Heterodoxy, Spinozism and Free Thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe*, a volume edited by Silvia Berti, Françoise Charles-Daubert and Richard Popkin, which deals particularly with the *Traité des Trois Imposteurs* and focuses on a period following the age of Reformation.[98] Two recent works are worthy of particular mention: *Renaissance Scepticism*, edited by Gianni Paganini and José R. Maia Neto who pay homage to Popkin

94 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*.

95 On the last topic, see: Muratori 2011, *La caduta*.

96 Popkin 1960, *The history of scepticism*; Schmitt 1972, *Cicero scepticus*.

97 Hunter/Wootton (eds.) 1992, *Atheism*.

98 Berti/Charles-Daubert/Popkin 1996, *Heterodoxy*.

and Schmitt as "founding fathers" of this field of study,[99] and Silvia Berti's *Anticristianesimo e libertà*, which includes most of the author's studies on the Radical Enlightenment.[100] These works suggest the need for a wider vision of the history of ideas in Early Modern Europe, and they suppose a perspective that closely links theology and philosophy. The so-called "intellectual crisis of the Reformation" (Popkin) not only created new confessional boundaries in Christian Europe, but was also crucial for the development of philosophical thought in subsequent centuries, and which would be incomprehensible apart from it. It was within this perspective that Antonio Rotondò devised his last scholarly project, which he was unfortunately unable to bring to fruition personally: a rich collection of essays in memory of Richard Popkin, written by the best international specialists and divided into eight thematic sections, from the renaissance of skepticism in the Early Modern Age to the connection between religion and natural law, from the European meaning of Spinozism to the relation between irenic visions and toleration.[101] Rotondò attached a similar significance to the projects he had devoted himself to since the early eighties, namely the two book series "Studi e testi per la storia religiosa del Cinquecento" and "Studi e testi per la storia della tolleranza in Europa nei secoli XVI–XVIII". The aim of the series was to show the connections between the theological debates of the sixteenth century and the political and philosophical thought of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, thus following the long course of the intellectual debate on toleration. The series is comprised of a total of twenty-nine volumes (some published posthumously), and has benefited from contributions by prominent European and American scholars such as Peter Bietenholz, John Tedeschi, Sarah Hutton, Joris van Eijnatten, Massimo Firpo, and Giuseppe Ricuperati. Another example of the intense research in the field on the often blurred line between religious and philosophical history is found in the book series "Sociniana," edited by Emanuela Scribano, definitely one of the most significant initiatives stemming from the celebrations of the fourth centenary of Fausto Sozzini's death.[102] As Scribano writes, the aim of the series is to provide scholars easy access to works of Socinian inspiration to clarify not only issues "about the identity of Socinianism, on the logic of its developments

99 Paganini/Maia Neto 2009, *Renaissance Scepticism*, p. 1. See also: Paganini 2008, *Skepsis*.

100 Berti 2012, *Anticristianesimo*.

101 The work was published posthumously by Luisa Simonutti and Camilla Hermanin. See: Hermanin/Simonutti (eds.) 2011, *La centralità*.

102 See the Acts of the Socinian conferences in Krakow and Siena, both in 2004: Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*; Priarolo/Scribano (eds.) 2005, *Fausto Sozzini*. See also the anastatic edition of Sozzini 2004, *Opera Omnia*.

over the decades, on its relations with the other heretical movements which arose from the Reformation" but also ". . . the contribution that Socinian culture has given to modern thought."[103] Among the most recent initiatives that have enabled the cross-pollination of different fields, the activity of the research group Emodir (Early Modern Religious Dissents and Radicalism) stands out. It is active through its website founded in 2007 thanks to the collaboration of European and American scholars, and strives to provide international scholars with opportunities to meet, discuss and learn about research projects carried out in different countries, following a multi-sided vision of sixteenth-century religious radicalism.

In conclusion, transcending the barriers between religious history and the history of ideas seems to be one of the most interesting research perspectives at the beginning of the new millennium. The use of the term "heretic" returns us to such a distinction, which seems to be justified more because of the needs of university curricula than by real differences in research fields. Classifications based on theological criteria are useful in reconstructing the history of religious movements or the origins of the reformed churches, but they cannot fully take into account the richness of the intellectual debate that developed during those crucial centuries. Moreover, rigid classifications cannot give a convincing sense of the experiences of those who did not join any organized church or group. They cannot help us understand, for example, why echoes of the debate between Francesco Pucci and Fausto Sozzini appear in John Locke's works, or how they influenced him, in the latter part of his life, to believe that a natural knowledge of God, and thus a salvation outside any church, was possible. They do not have anything to say about the deep religious crisis which led ex-Jesuit Christian Francken (1552–1610?) to doubt the existence of God, and to believe that every established religion has historical origins according to ideas similar to those of libertines and to the mysterious book *De tribus impostoribus*. Finally, without a broader vision of the Radical Reformation it becomes very difficult, or less significant, to understand why, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the term "Puccianism," derived from the name of the Florentine reformer Francesco Pucci, was used to refer to the theory of mankind's universal salvation through natural reason. These are just some examples of the persistence of ideas that came from the Radical Reformation. They survived in the history of European thought through the Modern age, even if they did not become part of the traditions of the main institutional churches. From the perspectives of institutional Churches, the voices of these men would be confined to a minor history of the heresies.

103 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. VII.

In a broader vision of the Radical Reformation, however, the "heretics" are considered to be the real reformers, dissidents, and radical interpreters of widely shared expectations. Today their critical attitude, which they paid for by marginalization, should be seen as a great cultural richness that contributed to the formation of European identity. They are at the root of such identity, since, as Antony McKenna and Pierre-François Moreau write: "not always the most important heritage is the heritage of the ideas that were considered the most important in their time."[104]

104 McKenna/Moreau 2010, *Le libertinisme*, p. 7.

CHAPTER 2

Travelers of Utopia: The Other Europe of the Italian Exiles *religionis causa*

2.1 Travelers of Utopia

The sixteenth century opened with great expectations of cultural, political, and religious renewal. The humanistic trust in reason, the theory of *homo faber*, and faith in the real possibility of changing the world and fighting against fate encouraged the development of utopian thought, and its hope for a new and better society. During the Renaissance, the concept of utopia had to apply to social relations and the rediscovery of the significance of a positive relationship with nature. As Thomas More wrote in *Utopia*, published in Louvain at the end of 1516, human virtue was no longer conceived as being derived from living heroically, as it had been for the ancients, or from living holily, as it was for Christian ascetics, but rather "secundum naturam vivere ad id siquidem a deo institutos esse nos."[1] More's book set out the main humanistic values: the rejection of medieval asceticism, the re-evaluation of the earthly world with travel as an instrument of knowledge, religious toleration and peaceful coexistence, a rationally organized society, and the hope of religious and moral revival. A great renewal of Christianity had been the hope of theologians, pastors, scholars, and common people since the late Middle Ages. More devoted a chapter of his book to this topic. The traveler Raphael Hythlodaeus speaks about the religion of Utopia's inhabitants. His words summarize some of the most debated ideas in the culture of the Early Modern Age, including the idea of a rational religion with only one dogma, i.e., "unum quoddan numen putant, incognitum, aeternum, immensum, inexplicabile, quod supra mentis humanae captum sit, per mundum hunc universum, virtute non mole diffusum, hunc parentem vocant."[2] According to More, all Utopians would agree on a single dogma and live in peace as long as fear of the divinities did not interfere. The Utopians also expressed an appreciation for the differences between cults because they thought that such differences would please the gods. The publication of *Utopia* was followed by an age of divisions and persecutions (Luther's 95 theses were posted a year after its first edition), but the dream of a natural religion, which

1 More 1518, *De optimo*, p. 104. See also: Firpo 1971, *Introduzione*, p. 8.

2 More 1518, *De optimo*, p. 141.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004335783_003

would be the same for all mankind and capable of removing every theological clash, remained in the collective imagination. An idea that had been generally appreciated when *Utopia* was first published (Erasmus wrote that all scholars were unanimous in admiring the divine genius of More),[3] became a radical and heterodox proposal several decades later.

Erasmus, the "prince of humanists" and friend of More, better represented some of these hopes at the beginning of century. He believed in a new Christian Europe without religious borderlines and founded on tolerance, spiritualism, peace, and a reasonable religion. He lived in the Modern Age during the deepest crisis of the Catholic Church, but always worked for its renewal (similar to More), opposing the Reformation and defending the unity of Christendom. A few years later, the division of the Christian world and the religious wars put an end to his dream. More was executed in July 1535. Erasmus' works were printed less often in the latter half of the century, and later put on the *Index* in Catholic countries. Erasmus was placed among the authors *primae classis*, or the heretics, in the *Index* that was published in Rome in 1559 by Paolo IV.[4] Many of Erasmus' statements that had been accepted in the early fifteenth century became suspicious shortly thereafter. Despite this, his thought expressed widely shared needs, and his heritage was founded on biblical criticism, the principle of *imitatio Christi* (an ethics religion without dogmas), and the importance of education, toleration, peace, human reason, and religious freedom. These ideas penetrated deeply into European culture, both inside and outside institutions. His idea of utopia survived in some religious movements (for example Alumbradism in Spain, from which emerged Juan de Valdès, who was later acknowledged as a master in Naples) and it was interpreted in a radical way by many reformers, especially Italian reformers who believed in the same humanistic principles.[5] In the first half of the sixteenth century, a large group of churchmen tried to promote a deep reformation inside the Roman Church, an alternative to both the intransigent line of the Holy Office and the break of Luther. Several high prelates, even at the top of the Roman Church, belonged to this school of thought, "Evangelism," including cardinals Morone, Contarini, Pole, and Sadoleto.[6] The establishment of the Roman Inquisition (the congregation of the Holy Office) in 1542, and the development and conclusion of the Council of Trent (1545–1563), and especially the battle in the

3 Erasmus Roterodamus Iohanni Frobenio compatri suo charissimo, Lovanii, 23 August 1517, in More 1518, *De optimo*, p. 2.

4 Gilly 2005, *Erasmo*, p. 38.

5 See *supra*: chapter 1.2.

6 On this topic see, for example: Gleason 1978, *On the Nature*; Simoncelli 1979, *Evangelismo*.

conclaves of 1550 and of 1555 until the election of Gian Pietro Carafa as pope[7] decreed the political defeat of any moderate position. The only alternatives were cultivating one's religious convictions in the secrecy of one's own conscience (Nicodemism) or running away. Many who had developed radical beliefs chose the latter. They often abandoned leading roles, wealth, and safety to pursue their ideals. They left their country to seek the eagerly awaited spiritual renaissance beyond the Alps. However, the imagined spiritual geopolitics of Europe was often quite different from what they found. They sought true faith and freedom of conscience, while even in the protestant world civil and religious renewal was being channeled within institutional churches in terms of rules and theological dogmas. In a short time there was no more space for free search and prophetical revelations.

Erasmus was also an assiduous traveler. Many types of people traveled in the early modern age: merchants, ambassadors and diplomats, princes and noblemen, pilgrims, and men of culture. They took with them goods, books, and ideas.[8] After the Reformation, the new religious borders made traveling more difficult and suspect; however, these borders also invited travel as they symbolized an escape to those who were persecuted, and hope for those who sought utopia. At the beginning, the exiles *religionis causa* followed the same routes as merchants, as shown by the city of Lyon, which was a strategic financial and commercial hub that became an extremely lively center for religious debate around the middle of the sixteenth century.[9] Many Florentine families of merchants and businessmen lived in Lyon, as well as a group of republican and anti-Medicean exiles.[10] A large number of families from Lucca lived in Lyon as well. The Anti-trinitarian Valentino Gentile arrived there after his first trial in Geneva in 1558. Fausto Sozzini arrived in 1561 while fleeing from Siena and, later, Francesco Pucci settled in Lyon and lived with the Rinuccini family during the sixties. The time they spent in Lyon was a decisive experience in each of their lives, and traveling became a characteristic of their existence.

Paris, London, Oxford, Louvain, Basel, and Italy were some of Erasmus' favorite destinations, as they offered universities, studies, and printing houses. Basel was most likely the city he loved the most and was the city in which he died. Erasmus was particularly close to the jurist Bonifacius Amerbach and

7 See: Firpo 2014, *La presa di potere*.

8 On the topic of travel in the Modern Age, see, for example: Mazzei 2013, *Per terra*.

9 See: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 268–271; Caravale 2007, *Da Firenze*; Caravale 2011, *Il profeta*, pp. 69–77; Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, pp. 157–184.

10 Among them was Jacopo Corbinelli. On Corbinelli see: Benzoni 1983: *Jacopo*; Carta 2008, *Francesco Guicciardini*, pp. 129–143, 170–187.

the printer Johann Froben, who published his main works. In the imagination of many exiles, Basel was the city of Erasmus, a symbol of refined culture, critical thinking, and religious freedom.[11] Basel was known for its printing houses that faced the Freie Strasse near the market area, except for the one owned by Oporinus, which stood in the almost peripheral area of Petersburg. The university in Basel had also grown in importance and, even if it could not compete with the greatest universities of Europe, it was appreciated for the freedom enjoyed by foreign students and for the reputation of some illustrious citizens and teachers such as Bonifacius and Basilius Amerbach, Jean Bauhin, and Theodor Zwinger. Sebastian Castellio arrived with his family after leaving Geneva in 1543, and obtained the chair of Greek Literature in 1552. Around him formed the "Basel circle," frequented by many exiles *religionis causa*, mostly Italian, such as the printer Pietro Perna, Celio Secondo Curione, Lelio Sozzini, Bernardino Ochino, and David Joris. The group's notoriety grew because of its reaction to the execution of Servetus in Geneva in 1553, and also because of the publication of *De haereticis an sint persequendis* in the spring of the following year.

Switzerland represented a new frontier for Italians who had decided to leave their country because of religious beliefs. It was also a trade route to the center of Europe. Valtellina, Valchiavenna, and the land of Grisons, which were natural roads for Italians headed north, became open doors to the Reformed world.[12] Through them the Italian exiles *religionis causa* reached the most important cities of the Reformation, especially Geneva and Zurich. A large community of Italians who had converted to Calvinism were living in Geneva with a core of families from Lucca, and there was also an important church of exiles, guided from 1561–1587 by Niccolò Balbani, a leading member of one of the Lucca families.[13] Many Italian reformers were guided to Geneva by Calvin's reputation, and desired to meet him. Some fully accepted his views and became reformed theologians (for example, Zanchi and Vermigli). The most radical thinkers (such as Lelio Sozzini, Ochino, Gribaldi, Biandrata, and Gentile) first discussed theology with him, and then decided (or were obliged) to leave the city after the 1553 execution of Servetus and the 1558 struggle of Calvin against

11 On the theological and cultural life of Basel in the second half of the sixteenth century, see: Bietenholz 1971, *Basle and France*; Plath 1973, *Calvin*; Rotondò 1974, *Pietro Perna*; Gilly 1977–1979, *Zwischen*; Guggisberg 1982, *Basel*.

12 See: Rotondò 1976, *Esuli italiani*; Pastore (ed.) 1991, *Riforma e società*; Pastore 2015, *Nella Valtellina*. See also: Caponetto 1997, *La Riforma*, pp. 274–277.

13 See: Ginzburg 1963, *Niccolò Balbani*. On religious exiles from Lucca in the sixteenth century, see: Adorni-Braccesi 1994, *Una città infetta*.

the Anti-trinitarians. Geneva became less and less the new Zion for Italian exiles in search of toleration. The same events also took place in Zurich, the city of Zwingli, one of the reformers most beloved by Italian humanists. When he died in the 1531 battle of Kappel, the theologian Heinrich Bullinger succeeded him. His willingness to hold discussions made Zurich a model of hospitality; however, even in Zurich, as in other towns in Switzerland, the control of theological censorship slowly became more pressing and religious dissent became less tolerated. Ochino and Lelio Sozzini had chosen to live in Zurich, thinking it was a safe and tolerant city, yet the former was expelled in 1563, the latter having died in solitude the year before.

At the end of the sixteenth century, the exiles *religionis causa* who still nurtured hopes of a spiritual renaissance and a return to the purity of the apostolic church, looked to the most tolerant countries of Eastern Europe, primarily Poland and Transylvania, where nobles, independent of the king, could still welcome them. The presence of Lutherans, Calvinists, Orthodox, Anti-trinitarians, Anabaptists, Hebrews, and Muslims in a country that was formally Catholic, made it unique in Europe. Francesco Pucci was impressed when he arrived in Krakow in November 1583. Pucci arrived from Germany, where he had spent several months in Helmstadt. He remembers this experience in a letter to his brother, where he describes Lutherans as drunks who had muddled God's word and oddly divided the church. In Krakow, however, he said that he had met peoples, "assai amorevoli" and "più capaci di ragione che io abbia incontrato fino ad ora." He stayed with the Piedmontese gentleman Prospero Provana, a key figure in the Italian community who was very close to heterodox and Anti-trinitarians,[14] and who received Pucci with open arms and "e mi tratta da amico, per non dir da fratello."[15] Even in Eastern Europe the space for religious freedom was becoming increasingly narrower in the new century. Already during the long reign of Sigismund III Vasa (1587–1632) there had been conflicting signals, and after the death of Fausto Sozzini (1604), the Anti-trinitarian Iwan Tyszkiewicz was executed in the great marketplace of Warsaw in 1611. The Jesuits had arrived in Poland the year before with the goal of reconquering the country for the Catholic faith. In 1638, the Socinian center of Raków, core of the movement, was closed. King John II Casimir Vasa (1648–1668), made cardinal in 1640 by Pope Innocenzo X, completed the reconquest of the kingdom. The last act of intolerance was the banishment of the

14 On Prospero Provana, see: Caccamo 1999, *Eretici*, pp. 75–79 and *passim*.

15 Francesco Pucci to brother Giovanni in Florence, Krakow, March 15, 1584, in Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, I, pp. 63–64.

Socinians from Poland in 1658: the "other Europe" of the exiles of utopia had ceased to exist.

2.2 Parallel Escapes: Pietro Martire Vermigli and Bernardino Ochino

The lives of Vermigli (Florence 1499—Zurich 1562) and Ochino (Siena 1487—Slavkov u Brna 1564/1565) have much in common. They were both forced to leave Italy to escape a possible inquisitorial trial, they were both important personalities of the Catholic Church, they came from similar religious backgrounds in Italy, they both initially headed to Zurich, and they shared some important stages of their exile *religionis causa*. Vermigli and Ochino looked at the world of the Reformation with great hopes and they both crossed the Alps believing that the long-awaited renovation of Christendom was possible, not from within the Church of Rome, but by going against it. Their lives had very different outcomes, however: Vermigli became one of the founding fathers of the Reformed Church,[16] and his works are widespread today in the Protestant World,[17] while Ochino died in a remote village in Moravia; today his name is known only to scholars.[18] Vermigli and Ochino belonged to the so-called Italian Reformation, not only because they spent most of their lives in Italy (Vermigli left his country at the age of 43, Ochino at 55), but because they often communicated with a few of the same figures related to Italian Evangelism, such as Juan de Valdés, Marco Antonio Flaminio, Pietro Carnesecchi, Gasparo Contarini, and Gian Matteo Giberti, who exerted their influence on them. The encounter with Valdés certainly made a deep impression on Ochino, even if McNair claims that they actually influenced one another and that Italian Evangelism was born as a consequence of their meeting,[19] which resulted in

16 Campi 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, p. 35.

17 On Vermigli see the three volumes published on the occasion of the fifth centenary of his birth: Campi (ed.) 2002, *Peter Martyr Vermigli*; Olivieri/Bolognesi (eds.) 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*; James (ed.) 2004, *Peter Martyr Vermigli*. See also: Campi/James/Kirby (eds.) 2009, *A companion*. A complete bibliography of Vermigli's works in: Donnelly/Kingdon 1990, *A Bibliography*. About his theological thought, see: Zuidema 2015, *Peter Martyr Vermigli*.

18 On Ochino see: Cantimori 1929, *Bernardino Ochino*; Bainton 1940, *Bernardino Ochino*; Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 128–134, 247–259 and *passim*; Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*; Gotor 2011, *Ochino*. An updated bibliography in: Gotor 2013, *Ochino*. See also: Camaioni 2013, *Nel segno*.

19 "To say, as has traditionally been said, that Valdés converted Ochino is only half the truth: it is equally true that Ochino converted Valdés" (McNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, p. 35).

the composition of *Alfabeto Cristiano* by Valdés, and sermons published by Ochino in Venice in 1540 titled *Dialoghi Quattro* and *Dialoghi Sette*.[20] Vermigli was also influenced by Valdés. Josias Simler, Zurich's most faithful disciple of Vermigli, wrote in November 1562 in his *Oratio*, following his master's death, that during Vermigli's stay in Naples "in hac urbe gratia divinae illuminationis illustrius ac clarius illi affulgere coepit."[21] However, only Ochino radicalized his Valdesian heritage. Vermigli was placed among the masters of the Reformed Church next to Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Zwingli, and Bullinger.[22] Emidio Campi, one of the main scholars of Vermigli, claimed that his biblical and theological scholarship, as well as his knowledge of Hebrew, was unusual among Italian reformers. Campi added that, when Vermigli was abbot at the convent of St. Peter ad Aram in Naples between 1537 and 1539, he read the books of Zwingli, Bucer, and Erasmus with great interest, and was perhaps more influenced by them than by Valdesian spirituality.[23] Yet Pietro Carnesecchi, during the inquisitorial trial in Rome in April 1567, said that he had met Vermigli "per mezzo del signor Valdes, del quale era molto amico." He was confessed by Vermigli and was very satisfied. Carnesecchi had never heard Vermigli speak about any dogma "ma solo della pietà et religione in generale,"[24] suggesting a deep relationship with Valdés and his tendency to emphasize piety and internal enlightenment. The traditional point of view that divides Vermigli's life into three very distinct stages (the Catholic orthodoxy until 1537, the interior rebirth in Naples and the religious crisis until his escape in 1542, the Reformed orthodoxy and his teaching in Protestant Churches) now seems less convincing. Philip McNair himself, after holding this viewpoint, today claims that the intellectual roots of the conversion of Vermigli must be placed at the time of his studies in Padua (1518–1526), about 12 years prior to his stay in Naples.[25] Vermigli had learned the doctrine of predestination before reading the *Christianae religionis Institutio* of Calvin, probably from the Augustinian tradition or perhaps from Gregory of Rimini, whose thought he had studied in Padua.[26] The idea of Christ's benefit was also not a completely original consequence of the relationship with Valdés, but, rather, belonged to Benedictine

20 Gotor 2013, *Ochino*, p. 96. See: Ochino 1985, *I Dialoghi*.

21 Simler 1563, *Oratio*, c. 6v.

22 Campi 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, pp. 34–35.

23 Campi 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, p. 19.

24 McNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, p. 173n.

25 A hypothesis already advanced in Domingo de Santa Teresa 1957, *Juan de Valdés*, p. 401 (see: McNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, p. 86).

26 See: James 1998, *Vermigli and Predestination*.

scholarship, probably to John Chrysostom, a Greek Church Father particularly loved by Vermigli.[27]

When Ochino first arrived in Naples for the Lenten sermons, it was the early spring of 1536. He was 49 years old and already well known, mainly as a preacher in many Italian cities. His severe spiritualism had driven him to the Observant Franciscans, then to the Order of the Capuchins. At that time he was the General Vicar of Cismontane Province. Ochino's sermons in the church of San Giovanni Maggiore in Naples were extraordinarily successful because of their call to spirituality and moral righteousness. Emperor Charles V himself heard them and was moved by the force of their words. Ochino established relations with Valdés' circle in Naples, probably feeling an affinity between his own Franciscan spirituality and that of Valdés, which originated from the mysticism of the Spanish Alumbrados movement, which extolled the inner Light, and devaluated worship. Ochino returned to Naples to preach between 1539 and 1540. His sermons became more heavily focused on the topic of justification by faith alone and on Christ's benefit, according to the thought of Valdés, so that the Theatine order, founded in 1524 by Gian Pietro Carafa, began to suspect him. Ochino, however, had many powerful patrons, among them Pope Paolo III. In June 1538, Ochino was elected General Vicar of Capuchins, the highest office in the order, and in 1541 he was reconfirmed. His reputation as the greatest preacher of the time led him to travel throughout Italy to wherever religious and civil authorities asked to hear his word.

Vermigli spent three years (1537–1540) at the convent of St. Peter ad Aram in Naples, which was typical for the Congregation of Lateran Canons, and met Ochino while there. Vermigli also aroused the suspicions of the Theatines; in fact, while he was expounding the first Letter of St. Paul to the Corinthians, exciting admiration for his learning and eloquence, the Spanish viceroy Don Pedro de Toledo forbade him to preach, probably because of an accusation from the Theatines.[28] However, Vermigli also had powerful friends in Rome, so the interdict was removed and he was able to continue his cycle of sermons. Nevertheless, suspicions of heterodoxy began to follow him. In November 1540 he was transferred to the Basilica of San Frediano in Lucca as Visitor of Regular Canons, and in May 1541 he was elected Prior, one of the most important religious offices in the city. Vermigli carried out his task of trying to reform religious life and putting his experience in Naples to good use.[29] Emidio Campi said that Vermigli transformed the Lateran house of San Frediano in the first

27 Collett 1985, *Italian Benedictine*. See: McNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, pp. 289–290.

28 On the episode, see: McNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, pp. 164–169.

29 See: Adorni-Braccesi 1994, *Una città infetta*, pp. 109–143 and *passim*.

theological reformed school in Italy;[30] Simonetta Adorni-Braccesi, on the other hand, argued that he remained within the sphere of the spiritual movement, emphasizing the doctrine of justification by faith alone but without a specific orientation for the Reformation.[31] Regardless, his work did not pass unnoticed. The reformist wing of the Roman Church appreciated his activity, and in July 1541 Contarini and Morone chose Vermigli to be Modena's Lenten preacher. In the same year the intransigent wing, under the leadership of Cardinal Gian Pietro Carafa (the future Pope Paul IV), obtained the first important recognition from the tribunal of the Roman Inquisition.[32] It was Carafa's success; he succeeded in turning a political line into an institutional structure at the top of the Catholic Church. The following year, on July 21, the tribunal of Santo Offizio took office with the Papal bull *Licet ab initio*. In addition to Carafa, the six members included Cardinal Guidiccioni of Lucca; they had the task of "repressing heresies and especially in Modena, Napoli and Lucca."[33]

In the meantime, Ochino's sermons continued to bring him great popularity. He was protected by powerful admirers but attacked by the Theatines. In 1542, he was suspended for three days because of a furious sermon delivered in Venice against the condemnation of Giulio della Rovere.[34] He was soon restored to his office, thanks again to Pope Paul III, and it was rumored that he would be named Cardinal. While he was staying in Verona with his friend Cardinal Matteo Giberti in July 1542, however, he was called to Rome, first by a friendly letter from Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, then officially by a Papal Brief. Although he was in doubt as to what to do, Giberti's advice convinced him to set out on the journey. On August 20, Ochino was in Florence in the Capuchin convent of Montughi. Shortly after, Vermigli arrived in Florence from Lucca, and stayed in Badia Fiesolana. Vermigli had convinced himself that he could not freely continue his work in Lucca because of what was going on in Rome, so he decided to leave Italy and go beyond the Alps. As soon as he knew that Ochino was also in Florence, he met him (perhaps in Caterina Cybo's house)[35] to convince him not to go to Rome. On August 22, Ochino wrote to

30 Campi 2003, *Pietro Martire*, p. 19.

31 Adorni-Braccesi 1994, *Una città infetta*, p. 119.

32 Firpo/Marcatto (eds.) 1981–1995, *Il processo*, II, p. 1031.

33 Firpo 2005, *Inquisizione romana*, p. 93. See also: Firpo 2014, *La presa di potere*.

34 Giulio della Rovere (1504–1581), also known as Giulio da Milano, was an Augustinian preacher. In the spring of 1541 he was tried and later convicted because he had defended Lutheran doctrines in the Lenten sermons at the St. Cassiano Church in Venice. About him, see: Rozzo 1989, *Della Rovere*; Dall'Olio 2010, *Giulio*.

35 Caterina Cybo (1501–1557), Duchess of Camerino, was a Florentine noblewoman, patroness of humanists and very close to Evangelism and Valdesianism. See: Petrucci 1981, *Cibo*; Vasoli 1996, *Caterina Cibo*; Moriconi (ed.) 2005, *Caterina Cybo*.

his follower Vittoria Colonna,[36] explaining the resolution he had taken: "sono stato particularmente da don Pietro Martire et da altri molto persuaso di non andare: perché non potrei se non negar Christo o esser crocifisso."[37] The following day he left the habit and walked alone toward Zurich wearing secular clothes. Vermigli followed a few days later. The latter wrote from Fiesole to his religious brethren in Lucca, explaining the reasons for his escape: "Alla persona mia hanno fatto necessario il partire tanti rumori levati a Lucca, a Roma contra la verità; si fussi rimasto mi bisognava al tutto o predicar contra il vero [. . .] ovvero saria incappato nelle mani de' persecutori dello evangelio."[38] They had both been induced to flee based on their fear of no longer being able to defend the truth. They also hoped to find new lands where religious truth was loved and fortified, the world of the Reformation, a utopian world where there was no need to "predicar sospetto et predicar Christo mascarato in gergo," as Ochino wrote.[39] Even more unequivocal were Vermigli's words, pronounced when he took the place of Konrad Pellikan as teacher of the Old Testament in 1556 in Zurich. He recalled the time of his flight from Italy, underlining his desire to personally see the new churches that audacious reformers were building beyond the Alps, so he would not have to imagine the Reformation only as an abstract Republic of Plato. Fear and constriction as well as a dream of utopia had prompted him to travel.[40]

Vermigli probably went to Zurich because he hoped to receive an appointment as a teacher at the Schola Tigurina. He was received with open arms by Bullinger, but there was no place at the school. He first headed towards Basel with a letter from Bullinger for Oswald Myconius, and then reached Strasbourg where he took the Old Testament chair, which had been held by Wolfgang Capito. He collaborated with Martin Bucer to develop and consolidate the Reformation, and became one of the most esteemed religious figures

---

36 Vittoria Colonna (1490–547) was an Italian noblewoman and poetess. She was very close to Evangelism (Valdès, Ochino, Carnesecchi, Pole) and among her literary and artistic friends were Michelangelo Buonarroti, Pietro Bembo, Baldassarre Castiglione, and others. See: Patrizi 1982, *Colonna*; Campi 1994, *Michelangelo*; Brundin 2008, *Vittoria Colonna*.

37 Benrath 1875, *Bernardino Ochino*, p. 107. See also: McNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, p. 282.

38 See: NcNair 1967, *Peter Martyr*, p. 265n.

39 Bernardino Ochino to Vittoria Colonna, Florence, August 22, 1542, in Benrath 1875, *Bernardino Ochino*, p. 107. See: McNair 1967, Peter Martyr, p. 283.

40 "Quare in Germaniam, viri theologi, me contuli, quo unde per literas prima repurgatae veritatis elementa gustaveram, indidem uberiorem absolutioremque doctrinam affatim biberem. Cupiebam etiam praesens aliquas restitutas Ecclesias contemplati, ne ceu rempublicam Platonis ecclesiae revocationem putarem, quae intelligi plane queat, sed nulla ratione alicubi locum habeat" (Vermigli 1624, *Loci Communes*, p. 744 I–745 A).

in the city.[41] His strength resided in biblical learning and in his experience as a teacher and organizer; the strength of Ochino, on the contrary, resided in his eloquence in Italian, and his extraordinary ability to convey ideas and feelings to the public. Ochino headed to Geneva, the "new Jerusalem" for many Italian exiles. Calvin was one of the reformers most appreciated by the Italians: here it is enough to recall the close relationship he shared with Renée of France and her circle of intellectuals and clergymen in Ferrara.[42] The city council of Geneva gave Ochino the position of minister of an Italian community, allowing him to preach in Italian in public. He used the pulpit to address the Italians still at home, railing against the Roman Antichrist and celebrating the true Church, which he identified as the church of Geneva.[43] In the *Sermones de fide*, published in 1544, Ochino demonstrated his enthusiasm for having left Italy and chosen Geneva, without perceiving any gap between the teachings of the Church and inner enlightenment, as described by Massimo Firpo.[44] At first, Calvin appreciated Ochino's work, claiming that he "nostrum prorsus ac sine exceptione esse."[45] Soon after, however, he began to have doubts about Ochino specifically and Italians in general; they, in his opinion, were too curious about theological questions.[46] Ochino left Geneva in 1545 (perhaps because of economic hardship, perhaps because of discomfort with Calvinist theological strictness) and went first to Augsburg, then to Strasbourg, where he once again met Vermigli. A few years later they both refused to accept the Augsburg *Interim* proposed by Emperor Charles V in 1548, preferring to travel to England at the invitation of Canterbury Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. At the time, Vermigli was a highly esteemed reformed theologian, and Ochino an indomitable anti-Catholic preacher.

Once in England, Ochino continued his controversy with the Church of Rome. He preached in London against the Pope-Antichrist, came into contact with the Crown (especially with the future Queen Elizabeth), and wrote

41 Campi 2004, *The Preces sacrae*.

42 Renée of France (1510–1575), the second daughter of Louis XII of France and Anne of Brittany, was married in 1528 to Ercole II d'Este and became the Duchess of Ferrara. She shared the ideas of the Reformation and was very close to Calvin himself. Her court at Ferrara was a meeting place for reformers and refugees. On Renée of France see: Caponetto 1997, *La Riforma*, pp. 279–281; *Encyclopedia of Women* 2007, pp. 321–323; Belligni 2008, *Evangelismo*. On the spread of Calvin's thought in Italy, see: Felici 2010, *Giovanni Calvino*.

43 In October 1542, Ochino published a volume of twenty sermons (Ochino 1542, *Prediche*) in Geneva. See: Gotor 2011, *Ochino*, p. 98.

44 Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, p. 206.

45 John Calvin to Pierre Viret, Geneva, September 1542. See: Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, p. 210.

46 See: Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, p. 210; Bainton 1940, *Bernardino Ochino*, pp. 63–64.

a tragedy in 1549 titled *A tragoedie or dialogue of the uniuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome*, wherein he contrasted Christ and the Pope, who was presented as a savage tyrant who had usurped the true Church of the spirit. Meanwhile, Vermigli was continuing his work as a teacher and reformer; he became a professor at Oxford University where he carried out an intense activity of exegesis and controversy on the topic of the Eucharistic sacrament. He had a deep influence on Cranmer and the group of bishops who drew up the new English liturgy as well as on the reform of the Anglican faith (the *XLII Articles* of 1553), and ecclesiastical organization (*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*).[47] The accession to the throne of Mary Tudor in 1553 and her policy of Catholic restoration obliged Vermigli and Ochino to return to continental Europe. Their paths crossed again a few years later in Zurich.

Ochino arrived in Zurich in 1555 via Geneva and Basel, and was appointed pastor of the Church of Locarno. The Italian exile Lelio Sozzini warmly supported him.[48] Ochino was 68 years old, quite an advanced age at that time, and Protestants still considered him a symbol of the Italian exiles who had had the courage to join the Reformed Church, denouncing the corruption of the Roman Church. However, in his later years Ochino had developed a more radical position, as evidenced by his relationship with Lelio Sozzini and Sebastian Castellio. In October 1553 he returned to Geneva where the tragic trial of Servetus had recently ended. Servetus had been burned at the stake, a case that had provoked shock across the Protestant world, particularly among the exiles *religionis causa*. Ochino, being a friend of Castellio, was suspect, but he maintained good relations with Calvin, who kindly recommended him to Bullinger in Zurich. In turn, Ochino praised Calvin in a letter of December 1555. The controversy of the Roman Antichrist decreased in Ochino's sermons, and his focus shifted to Christian virtues and the evangelization of the Reformed community. In 1556, his work against the Lutheran theologian Joachim Westphal regarding Christ's presence at the Lord's Supper resulted in suspicions and criticism from Calvin, Bèze, Haller, and Farel.[49] Ochino's spiritualism led him to a clearer distinction between *adiaphora* and *fundamentalia fidei*, which removed the importance of doctrinal orthodoxy, including the doctrine of the Reformed Church. In his opinion, the single article of faith necessary for salvation was "che vivamente crediamo, et con spirito gustiamo, et sentiamo, che Giesù è Christo figliuol di Dio, morto per noi con somma charità, per gratuita

47 See: McNair 1980, *Peter Martyr*. For more updated bibliographical references, see also: Campi 2003, *Pietro Martire*.

48 See: Sozzini 1986, *Opere*, p. 217.

49 Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, pp. 219–221.

volontà del padre."[50] The turning point was the *Laberinti del libero o ver servo arbitrio* (Basel 1561), in which Ochino went beyond the doctrines of predestination, divine prescience and Christian freedom, emphasizing inner enlightenment and *docta ignorantia*.[51] His relationship with Lelio Sozzini in Zurich and Sebastian Castellio in Basel (who translated the *Laberinti* in Latin),[52] as well as his connection with other radical exiles (Betti, Lismanini, and Aconcio) probably led him to believe in the uselessness of any dogma in the pursuit of final salvation, as proved by the Gospel episode of the Good Thief. The decisive step was the *Dialogi XXX*,[53] translated into Latin by Castellio and printed in Basel by Pietro Perna in 1563 without the permission of the authorities. In this work, Ochino questioned not only predestination but also the Trinity, and defended the principles of toleration and religious freedom. He was expelled from Zurich on the charge of defending polygamy, a pretext for his expulsion. The Protestant world, initially identified as Utopia, no longer seemed attractive to Ochino: "trova che una Chiesa è Zwingliana, l'altra Luterana, et che alcuni sono Anabattisti, gli altri Libertini, et così di diverse sette, et fra di loro sono molto diversi et contrarii, donde ne seguitano mormorationi, discordie, detrattioni, infamie, calunnie, odii, persecuzioni, et innumerabili mali, havendo ciascuna Chiesa per heretica l'altra."[54] Ochino was 76 years old and a widower, supporting four sons when he was forced to begin a new life.

Vermigli's six years in Zurich were the most productive of his life.[55] In 1556 he was called to replace Konrad Pellikan as the chair of the Old Testament, and he had a leading role in the city's political and religious life. Vermigli participated in the drafting of the *Second Helvetic Confession*, and his works, some of which were published posthumously, became fundamental for generations of theologians. *Loci communes*, a posthumous anthological collection of some of his writings, became one of the most known books in the Protestant world, and 14 editions were published between 1576 and 1656.[56] When Vermigli died (November 12, 1562), he was buried in the cloister of the Cathedral. Thirteen

50 Ochino 1561, *Disputa*, pp. 173–174. See also: Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, p. 224.

51 Ochino 1561, *Prediche* (but now see: Ochino 2004, *Laberinti*). See also: Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, pp. 226–230; Bracali 2004: *Simmetria*.

52 On the relationship with Lelio Sozzini, see: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 247 ff. On the discussions between Ochino and Castellio about the nature of faith, see the letter published in: Benrath 1875, *Bernardino Ochino*, pp. 307–308; Buisson 1892, *Sebastien Castellion*, 1, pp. 228–229. See also: Firpo 2001, *Boni Christiani*, p. 227–229.

53 Ochino 1563, *Dialogi XXX*.

54 Ochino 1562, *La quinta parte*, p. 166.

55 On Vermigli in Zurich, see: Baumann 2013, *Petrus Martyr*.

56 Vermigli 1576, *Loci Communes*. See: Campi 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, pp. 33–34.

years later, his colleague and friend Heinrich Bullinger, antistes of Zürich, wanted to be buried close to him. In a letter dated 17 September, 1571 to Christoph Herdesianus, Bullinger remembered Vermigli with warm words, underlining his difference from many other Italian exiles ("nihil tam Italicorum habere morum"), especially Lelio Sozzini, whom he argued was overly intellectually curious and opposed to the simplicity of faith.[57] However, Vermigli's relationship with the radical Italian exiles was more complex than Bullinger suggested, and remains an open question. We can only say that Vermigli was always rather indulgent towards Lelio Sozzini and Bernardino Ochino. In Zurich, he strengthened his friendship with them in spite of their radical viewpoints, and he recommended Lelio to Calvin in 1558, praising him for his moral integrity.[58]

Ochino traveled to Krakow, arriving in the spring of 1564. In August, all Italian exiles were expelled by a royal edict, so he decided to push on to Transylvania, where there was a regime of religious toleration. Ochino stayed in Pinczów, where he may have lost his sons due to a plague epidemic. Although his exact movements during this time are unclear, we know that he arrived at Austerlitz, Moravia (today Slavkov u Brna), and remained there with the Italian Anabaptist Niccolò Paruta.[59] He died alone; we are uncertain whether his death occurred in 1564 or 1565.

2.3 The Hard Choice of Fausto Sozzini

Fausto Sozzini had a very important role in the history of the Reformation. He was the only reformer who gave his name to a Church subsequent to Luther and Calvin, creating the third alternative to the Roman Catholic Church. Fausto Sozzini was the author of the basic text of Anti-trinitarianism in Poland (the *Explicatio primae partis primi capitis Evangelistae Johannis* published anonymously in Transylvania 1568 by Giorgio Biandrata and Ferenc Dávid, but written between May 1562 and June 1563 in Switzerland);[60] he gave unity and

57 "Quoties, me audiente, acerbissime obiurgabat Laelium Socinum et socios eius Italos, Polonos, item nonnullas mirificas et curiosissimas quotidie quaestiones contra fidei simplicitatem vertentes" (Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, ms 1456, f. 50v). See: Stella 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, p. 83.

58 Stella 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, p. 83.

59 See: Rothkegel 2014, *Paruta*.

60 Sozzini 1656, *Explicatio*. On the origins and history of this text, see: Szczucki 1967, *La prima edizione*; Rotondò 1967, *Atteggiamenti*, pp. 201–226; Marchetti 1975, *Le Explicationes*; Sozzini 1986, *Opere*, pp. 347 ff.; Marchetti 1999, *I simulacri*, pp. 7–9.

theological identity to Anti-trinitarian groups in Poland, and they later adopted the name "Socinians." Nevertheless, his last years were marked by the intolerance that had spread throughout Poland during the Catholic reconquest.[61] In 1598, he was assaulted in his own house by a group of Catholic students who destroyed his books and writings. Fausto saved himself by chance, but no longer felt safe living in Krakow and retired to the quiet village of Lusławice where he died on March 3, 1604. Fausto had left Italy nearly thirty years before in the second half of 1575. He was not a clergyman in Italy; his letters include no trace of theological interest until the last months of 1561 when he was 22.[62] Furthermore, as Valerio Marchetti writes, there were no references to ethical or political problems;[63] literary interests were prevalent, in accordance with his affiliation with the Accademia degli Intronati in Siena. In November 1593, when Fausto was already the leader of the Unitarian Church in Krakow, he wrote to Valentin Schmalz, one of his most faithful followers, urging him "meque imitare noli, qui nescio quo malo genio ductore, cum iam divinae veritatis fontes degustassem, ita sum abreptus, ut maiorem et potiorem iuventutis meae partem, inanibus quibusdam aliis studiis, immo inertiae potius atque otio dederim."[64] However, it is a judgment *a posteriori*; the course of events clearly shows that Sozzini's life was a collection of troubled and difficult choices.

Sozzini was born to a Sienese family with a significant legal tradition. Mariano was a well-known lawyer, who began teaching at the University of Bologna in 1542. His sons (Cornelio, Camillo, and Celso) lived with Mariano, as did his nephew Fausto, who spent his childhood and part of his youth in Bologna. Mariano had some troubles with the Inquisition, and in 1554 inquisitor Girolamo Muzzarelli was obliged to privately recall him to the order.[65] In 1557, after Mariano's death, the family returned to Siena, which had come under the dominion of Cosimo de' Medici. At first, Cosimo de' Medici's appeasement policy fostered good relations with the ancient families in Siena, as evidenced by the reopening of the Accademia degli Intronati, the center of intellectual city life. Fausto entered the Academy in 1557 together with other members of influential families such as Girolamo Bargagli, Marcantonio Cinuzzi, and Niccolò Spannocchi. His academic name was "il Frastagliato" (the Jagged). Fausto spent several years enjoying an intense social life, devoting

61 The only comprehensive Fausto Sozzini's biography is: Chmaj 1963, *Faust Socyn*. See also: Szczucki 2005, *Fausto Sozzini*; Scribano 2004, *Introduzione*; Scribano 2011, *Fausto Sozzini*.

62 Marchetti 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 34–35.

63 Marchetti 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 31–32.

64 Faustus Socinus ad Valentinum Smalcium, Cracoviae, November 15, 1593, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 459.

65 See: Marchetti 1975, *Gruppi*, pp. 144–145.

himself to poetry and writing verses in the manner of Petrarch. His muse was a gentlewoman named Virginia Spannocchi, whom he celebrated with the poetic name of Delia. He dedicated the following verses to her:[66]

> Vostri vivaci lumi
> Fan che per voi ardendo io mi consumi,
> Ma scemeria l'ardore,
> Se gentil come il nome haveste il cuore.
> Il vostro dolce riso
> D'amara doglia m'have il cuor conquiso,
> Ma finiria il dolore,
> Se gentil come il nome haveste il cuore.

The eyes, the smile, the pains of the heart, the dichotomy between the hardness of the heart and the kindness of women, are typical elements of sixteenth century Petrarchism. Fausto was not an improvised poet, but entirely a man of letters. In early 1558, members of eminent Sienese families were suspected of heresy, above all Cinuzzi, Buoninsegni, Spannocchi, and Sozzini.[67] Also included were Cornelio, Camillo, and Fausto.[68] It is now known that Fausto left Siena for this reason,[69] and in the spring of 1561 he went to Lyon.[70]

Lyon was a nerve center for finance and commerce in the Early Modern Age. Many Italian families had close relations with the city and often sent their sons to Lyon to obtain work experience. Lyon was also the center of Calvinism in France, the "other Geneva" or "the key and the gate of the heresies in the kingdom of France" according to the Catholic Archbishop François de Tournon.[71] Approximately a third of the citizens professed reformed religion, and the whole city came into the hands of the Reformed Church between the spring of 1562 and the summer of 1563 until the issue of the edict of Amboise (March 1563). The presence of so many merchants, especially Italian merchants, was another reason for the large population of radical reformers. Valentino Gentile took refuge with them after his escape from Geneva. Calvin referred

66 Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 61.

67 Marchetti 1975, *Gruppi*, pp. 148–164.

68 Marchetti 1975, *Gruppi*, p. 150n.

69 Marchetti 1969, *Sull'origine*.

70 Delio Cantimori, for example, supposed a commercial experience (Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, p. 338); Ludwik Chmaj suggested a study trip (Chmaj 1963, *Faust Socyn*, p. 44). See also: Marchetti/Zucchini (eds.) 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 12–14.

71 Gascon 1971, *Grand commerce*, II, p. 465. See: Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, p. 162.

to Lyon as an "Epicureorum caterva,"[72] and two years later Pierre Viret spoke about a group he called "deist."[73] Théodore de Bèze, during the 1566 debate on the Lord's Supper with two members of the Italian community, Ludovico Alamanni and Cappone Capponi,[74] represented Lyon as a town corrupted by money, a "new Corinth" (in reference to the second letter of Saint Paul to the Corinthians), where inquisitive and unquiet men, primarily Italians, were threatening the religious order.[75] At the beginning of the 1560s, other Italian exiles, in addition to Valentino Gentile (and perhaps Giampaolo Alciati), lived in or visited Lyon: Filippo Rustici from Lucca,[76] who lived in Geneva but often took part in the religious life of Lyon; Niccolò Camogli from Genova,[77] a merchant who later moved to Basel and was in contact with heretical circles; Dario Scala from Siena, linked to Sozzini's family;[78] Francesco Betti from Rome,[79] a friend of Lelio and Fausto Sozzini; the nobleman Antonio Maria Besozzi from Milan[80] who traveled between Lyon, Basel, and Zurich where he was tried in 1564 because he had denied the Trinity, the existence of hell, and original sin; and the anti-Medicean historian Michele Bruto from Venice,[81] who published *Historiae Florentinae* in Lyon and was later very close to Fausto in Poland. In Lyon, Fausto Sozzini joined the group of Italian Calvinists coming from Lucca, together with Matteo Balbani, Paolino Minutoli, and Giuseppe Giova. Sozzini likely lived in Balbani's house, which became a meeting place for Italian immigrants.[82] Fausto maintained an extensive correspondence with Siena, particularly with Girolamo Bargagli and the Accademia degli Intronati.

---

72 Calvin 1870, *Impietas*, col. 367. See also: Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, p. 164.

73 « J'ay entendu qu'il y en a de cette bande, qui s'appellent Deistes, d'un mot tout noveau, lequel ils veulent opposer à Atheiste » (Viret 1564, *Exposition*, c. Vv). See also: Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, p. 164.

74 See: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 268–271; Caravale 2007, *Da Firenze*, pp. 265–268; Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, pp. 169–175.

75 Théodore de Bèze to Heinrich Bullinger, Geneva, April 22, 1564, in Bèze 1968, *Correspondance*, v, p. 53. See: Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, p. 176n.

76 See: Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, pp. 176–177.

77 See: Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, pp. 177–178.

78 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 37.

79 See, for example: Firpo 1955, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 260–263 (now see: Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 70–72).

80 See: Tedeschi 1967, *Besozzi*; Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 272–279; Addante 2014, *Valentino Gentile*, p. 179.

81 See: Caccamo 1972, *Bruto*; Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 334–336; Caccamo 1999, *Eretici*, pp. 145–152.

82 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 15.

Letters usually came to Lyon through Lucca, following the commercial trade routes that linked the two cities. However, some of the correspondence between Fausto and Girolamo Bargagli was delivered by the Genoese merchant Giuseppe Franchi, himself an amateur poet, probably because the route through Genova was safer than others.[83] The letters show that in the first months of Fausto's stay in Lyon, his literary and worldly interests were not replaced by religious ones. Bargagli wrote to him about Delia and other women and friends of Accademia, as well as presenting literary discussions and poetry. In a letter dated 20 September, 1561, he informed Fausto about some new books in Italy, among them the *Metamorfosi* of Gian Andrea dell'Anguillara, an edition of *Amadigi* by Bernardo Tasso, and works of Lodovico Dolce. Bargagli also wrote about the debate between Annibal Caro and Lodovico Castelvetro on the sense and use of the metaphor.[84] Some important changes occurred in the autumn, although literary interests still prevailed. Delia's name disappeared from the correspondence, and later Fausto expressed a special predilection for writing religious poetry. In early October, Bargagli sent him the *Opere toscane* by the Italian poetess Laura Battiferri, some sacred poems and a paraphrase of the *Psalms*.[85] Fausto was enthusiastic in his letter, as Bargagli wrote later to Bartolomeo Ammannati.[86] The following month, Bargagli sent *Odi Spirituali* by Marcantonio Cinuzzi to Lyon through Giuseppe Franchi, for which Fausto was waiting.[87] This document is a good example of Italian reformed poetry, and is particularly close to Calvinist poetry, such as Théodore de Bèze's.[88] However, it included traces of radical ideas, for example the humanity of Christ. Fausto's poetry followed this path, from the Petrarchan lyric to the vulgarization of the Psalms.[89] The deep change in Fausto's life was reported in a letter from Bargagli to Pier Luigi Capacci dated 31 December, 1561, wherein he mentioned the strange transformation ("una metamorfosi stravagante") of

83 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 15–16.

84 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 20–21, 69–72.

85 Battiferri 1560, *Il primo*. Laura Battiferri (Urbino 1523—Florence 1589) was an Italian poetess of the sixteenth century. She married the Florentine Niccolò Ammannati and moved to Florence. A circle of humanists and artists gathered around her, among them Agnolo Bronzino, Annibal Caro, Benvenuto Cellini, Bernardo Tasso, and Pier Vettori.

86 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 21n.

87 Girolamo Bargagli to Giuseppe Franchi, Siena, Novembre 8, 1561 (Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 22n).

88 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 23. On Protestant poesy in the sixteenth century, see: Richter 1073, *Jean de Sponde*.

89 Some examples of Sozzini's vulgarizations of Psalms in: Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, pp. 63–67.

his friend.[90] However, the key event occurred in the spring of 1562, when Fausto was informed by Antonio Maria Besozzi of the sudden death of his uncle Lelio in Zurich, on May 14, at the age of 37.[91] Fausto immediately went to Zurich to recover his uncle's writings. Lelio had been one of the leading members of the "Basel circle," and a friend of Bernardino Ochino and Sebastian Castellio. In his last years he had written one of the basic texts of sixteenth-century Anti-trinitarianism, the *Brevis explicatio in primum Iohannis caput*,[92] in which he provided a new interpretation of the Biblical passage that the Trinitarian dogma was based upon. His criticism of the Trinity doctrine was probably discussed in the religious radicalism circles in Basel and Zurich, so that soon after Ochino turned to Anti-trinitarianism (1562–1563), Castellio translated *Dialogi XXX* to Latin and Ochino was banished from Zurich. Fausto stayed in Basel and Zurich for almost two years, likely longer than he had expected. Perhaps he was received by Lelio's friends as a potential continuer of his work. Fausto studied Lelio's writings and wrote, between May 1562 and June 1563, the *Explicatio primae partis primi capitis Evangelistae Johannis*, developing his uncle's thought. By now, Fausto was outside the worldly life of Siena. In a letter from Zurich written in April 1563 to Girolamo Bargagli, Fausto said that all festive evenings, once so much loved, were now less important to him. Nevertheless, his literary interests were not set aside; the letter ended with some verses and the request for a copy of Boccaccio's *Decameron*.[93] Fausto simply transferred his knowledge of philology and literary rhetoric to biblical hermeneutics, as Valerio Marchetti writes, with radical consequences. For example, the debate on the significance of the metaphor between Annibal Caro and Ludovico Castelvetro, which he had discussed with Bargagli, influenced his remarks on the use of metonymy in the *Explicatio*.[94] One can say that Fausto analyzed the sacred texts as he would have any other literary text, even if it was the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, the main Biblical passage to support the Trinity dogma.[95] This is one of the peculiarities of Socinian rationalism.[96]

---

90 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 34n.

91 In his last years, Lelio stood aside and lived in the house of an Anabaptist silk weaver (see: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, p. 237).

92 Sozzini 1986, *Brevis explicatio*.

93 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 85–86.

94 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 20–21.

95 Together with *I Ioh.*, v, 7–8, the so-called "comma Ioanneum."

96 Fausto did not question the Bible's divine inspiration, as he wrote in *De sacrae scripturae auctoritate*; thus, he founded his theological thought on philological interpretation of sacred texts.

At the end of June 1563, Fausto returned to Italy. He was in Mantua from early July until the first week of August, where he met the notary Andrea Stancari, who likely had to settle his property in anticipation of a long stay outside of Italy.[97] It seems that Fausto had decided to continue the mission of his uncle in search of a deep renovation of Christendom for the Reformation. From August 17 to 24 he was in Bologna, then spent August 25 to September 22 or 23 in Siena, and obtained the protection of Cosimo de'Medici. In November Fausto wrote to Camillo Sozzini to discuss whether he should return immediately to Switzerland or remain in Italy to complete his law studies. He anticipated that by the next summer he would have left Italy.[98] However, in the following years his decisiveness wavered. He had become the secretary of Monsignor Séraphin Olivier Razali in Rome, and from October 1569, he held the position of secretary of Paolo Giordano Orsini and his wife Isabella de'Medici. By now, Fausto was no longer a militant reformer, but a courtier. He maintained contact with the group of exiles, continued to take care of Lelio's writings that were kept by Francesco Betti and Guarnerio Castiglione, and later, unsuccessfully, requested the *Explicatio* manuscript.[99] Fausto had reentered the worldly life in Siena. Perhaps he was dissimulating his true thoughts, a widespread practice in moral and religious life in Italy, so-called Nicodemism;[100] however, records of his life during his long stay in Italy do not contain any traces of theological propaganda.

Fausto Sozzini stayed in Italy for twelve years. His homecoming was celebrated by Girolamo Bargagli in his work *Dialogo de' giuochi che nelle vegghie sanesi si usano di fare* (1563–1564),[101] in which Fausto appears as a character who discusses how to cheer parties and dances with games and cultured entertainments. Sentimental atmospheres began to reappear in his poetry and female figures reacquired centrality. In 1571 Agostino Ferentilli published some gallant and allegorical stanzas by Fausto.[102] The first was devoted to Delia and

97 Fausto Sozzini to [Camillo Sozzini], [Bologna], November 3, 1563, in Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 88.

98 "Io son d'animo quasi risoluto, poi che questo verno non ci veggo la commodità, di dar di volta questa state che verrà per vedervi et consigliarmi in tutto e per tutto" (Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, p. 91).

99 Marchetti/Zucchini 1982, *Aggiunte*, pp. 38–39, 96–97, 102–104.

100 On the significance of the term, see: Rotondò 1967, *Atteggiamenti*; Ginzburg 1970, *Il nicodemismo*; Biondi 1974, *Eresia*.

101 Bargagli 1982, *Dialogo*. See: Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, pp. 10–11.

102 Ferentilli (ed.) 1571, *Primo volume*. The collection was republished, with some changes, in 1579, and later, with additions, in 1584.

contained many biographical references. The opening verses refer to his painful separation from the woman he loved due to his divine vocation:[103]

> Quando lunge da voi mi spinse il cielo
> Onde il principio fu delle mie pene

In the following verses the poet claims that only the distance between the two lovers had forced the woman to reveal her love, warming her heart that had once been so cold. Fausto added that one of the reasons he had returned to Siena was to meet her again.[104] Now he could sing her praises in the hope of obtaining glory. All these elements (*amor de lohn*, a hard-hearted woman, solitude and return, and the pursuit of poetic glory) are common characteristics of Petrarchism; however, they may have contained some autobiographical references. As Emanuela Scribano wrote, when Fausto returned to Siena, he was determined to return to his former literary activity and to once again be a poet.[105] We do not know why Fausto remained in Italy for so long, nor why he decided to leave again in 1575; undoubtedly both choices were very difficult. Fausto was uncertain whether to devote himself to literary glory, a political career and Delia, or to devotion, religious truth, and the renovation of Christendom. The death of his beloved sister Fillide,[106] the death of his master Ludovico Castelvetro,[107] and perhaps his increasingly complex relationship with the Medici family,[108] probably pushed Fausto to make a difficult decision that had been delayed for too long. The attempts of Grand Duke Francesco I to convince him to return were useless. The second half of 1575 found Fausto in Basel, where he was greeted as a master by old friends of Lelio. Fausto began a new life, or rather, he began again. Three years later he left for Transylvania

---

103 Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 25.

104 "E quando men parea, ch'un sì gran foco/crescer potesse, da cui sol fui spinto/a rivolgere il piede al patrio loco,/ove già entrai d'amor nel laberinto,/quelle, che l'amar dolce, e'l pianger gioco/mi fer, vostre bellezze, ond'io fui vinto,/sì cresciute trovai, che 'l petto m'arse/di maggior fiamme da' vostri occhi sparse" (Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 27).

105 Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 13. Some traces of Fausto's moral engagement, with references to religious thought, are in the stanzas *Trionfo dello Sdegno*, published in Ferentilli (ed.) 1571, *Primo volume*. Now see: Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, pp. 33–36. See also: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 342–343.

106 See the sonnet devoted to Fillide in Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 57.

107 See the sonnet devoted to Castelvetro in Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 58. See also: Cantimori 1992, *Eretici*, pp. 345–346. On Lodovico Castelvetro see: Marchetti/Patrizi 1979, *Castelvetro*.

108 Isabella was killed by Paolo Giordano Orsini on July 14, 1576, perhaps with the connivance of Francesco I de' Medici. See the sonnet devoted to Isabella in Sozzini 2004, *Rime*, p. 37.

to engage in a dispute with Ferenc Dávid and then remained in Poland for 25 years until his death. In the summer of 1584 he married Elisabeth Morsztyn, who bore him a daughter, Agnese. Elisabeth died the following year.

2.4 Francesco Pucci and the Realistic Utopia

Miriam Eliav-Feldon, in *Realistic Utopias* (1982), defined "utopia" as a "literary work describing an ideal society created by conscious human effort on this earth."[109] She underlined how genuine utopians "do not indulge in fantasies about unattainable Gardens of Eden, but propose practical, though sometimes very drastic remedies for the defects of their societies."[110] In the sixteenth century, Utopia was not the image of an abstract world, springing from the mind of a dreamer, but a project that was considered achievable. In a time when religious thought was so important, and the expectation of a deep change in Christendom was widespread, religious utopias were largely present in collective imagery, especially among the exiles *religionis causa*. Heliav-Feldon mentioned the Florentine reformer Francesco Pucci and the anonymous work attributed to him, *Forma d'una republica catolica*,[111] including it among the utopias of the "secret society (real or imaginary)."[112] This work (and its author) satisfies two conditions fundamental to realistic utopias: first, utopia is not described as a hope for the future, but as existing or having the potential to exist in the present; second, it goes beyond the perspective of *contemptus mundi* and suggests a positive conception of mankind, entirely destined for salvation and happiness.[113] Heliav-Feldon agreed with Luigi Firpo (and Delio Cantimori, before him), believing that Pucci was the only author of the book and that the book was the fruit of his imagination.[114] In my opinion, the question is more complex and opens up new and interesting perspectives.

---

109 Eliav-Feldon 1982, *Realistic Utopias*, p. 2.

110 Eliav-Feldon 1982, *Realistic Utopias*, p. 2.

111 *Forma d'una republica Catolica, cioè universale, composta di diversi collegi d'uomini, i quali vivono forestieri per gli altrui paesi, o come forastieri in casa loro, e tutti riconoscono per loro soprano Dio, e dopo lui la Dieta overo Senato, nel qual concorrono i deputati de diversi collegi, che in vari luoghi s'adunano*. The text was partially published in Cantimori/Feist (eds.) 1937, *Per la storia*, pp. 171–209. Subsequently, it was entirely published in Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 263–298.

112 Eliav-Feldon 1982, *Realistic Utopias*, p. 4.

113 Eliav-Feldon 1982, *Realistic Utopias*, pp. 5, 6.

114 Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le périple*, pp. 114–115.

Francesco Pucci was in England twice: first between 1572 and 1576, at the beginning of his nearly 24 years of acting as an apostolate in the Protestant world; and again between 1579 and 1582, when he published his first important work in Italian, *Informatione della religione christiana*, printed by John Wolf in London at the end of 1579.[115] *Forma d'una republica catolica* also dates back to this second period, since the only known manuscript dates after June 1581. Pucci came from Basel, where he had tried to involve sincere lovers of truth, outside of churches and institutions, in a great debate on the topic of his religious belief that all men are already saved in the maternal womb by Christ's benefit, and therefore effective by nature against original sin.[116] Because of this attempt, he had to leave Basel. However, he was convinced that he could carry out his plan from England. In his previous stay in London and Oxford, despite disagreements and hostilities, Pucci had entered into relationships with several people, some of whom were influential.[117] This explains why, a few months after his arrival on British soil, he had the opportunity to print the *Informatione*. Pucci was moving within a close net of relationships; his plans were not solitary dreams, but rather the results of discussions, relationships, and hopes shared by many others. There was another Europe of radicals, travelers, merchants, intellectuals, artisans and common peoples living restlessly and full of hope, often (but not always) outside the institutions. This sub society was able to organize itself into groups, movements, and secret societies, while also sustaining projects of deep cultural change. This "other Europe," frequented by exiles *religionis causa*, was perhaps less visible but no less important and certainly no smaller than the churches and universities. The romantic image that Barnavi and Eliav-Feldon give us of Pucci as an "isolated man, without masters or followers, without Church or patrons" is no longer acceptable today.[118]

Once in London, Pucci contacted the printer Johann Wolf. Wolf had just returned from Italy, where he had spent time perfecting his craft in Florence with the printer Giunti. He planned to work in London. Wolf began working under the protection of Sir Philip Sidney, who had returned from nearly four years in Europe (Germany, Italy, and Austria, between 1572 and 1575). Philip Sidney was a brilliant man of letters and a scholar, to whom Giordano Bruno

115 See: Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*. See also: Firpo 1967, *Nuove ricerche*, pp. 1070–1074.

116 Pucci expressed this idea for the first time in the *Thesis agli amanti della verità* (1578), in Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, I, pp. 21–23.

117 On Pucci's first stay in England, see: Firpo 1951, *Francesco Pucci*; Rotondò 1974, *Il primo*; Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le périple*, pp. 51–77; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 19–24.

118 Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le periple*, p. 110. See: Carta 2012, *Il nostro allievo*, pp. 234–235.

later devoted *Spaccio de la bestia trionfante* (1584) and *De gli eroici furori* (1585), both written in England. One of John Wolf's main editorial consultants was the Italian exile Jacopo Castelvetro, nephew of Ludovico, who was a friend and mentor of Fausto Sozzini.[119] Jacopo returned to London in 1580 after having left Modena, where he had undergone an inquisitorial trial. Castelvetro did not take part in the theological debates in Europe, nor did he join the Italian Church in London (he was defined as "attending no church");[120] however, he corresponded with many radical thinkers, including Francesco Betti, Camillo Sozzini, and Francesco Pucci, who he may have met in Lyon. For this reason, he continued to attract the suspicions of the Inquisition. Thomas Bodley was another important figure connected with John Wolf. Bodley was about to return to England after spending several years in Europe. Bodley was also in contact with some Italian exiles (Francesco Pucci, Jacopo Corbinelli, and Jacopo Castelvetro), as evidenced by the correspondence of the papal nuncio in Paris, Anselmo Dandino, to the Secretary of State in Rome, the Cardinal Tolomeo Galli.[121] Beginning in May 1580, Dandino had pointed out suspicious movements of Castelvetro between France and Basel (perhaps he was trying to publish some forbidden books), and expressed concern over his relationships with Francesco Pucci and Jacopo Corbinelli, the latter of whom was in Paris.[122] Thomas Bodley was also corresponding with Pucci from Paris. On February 29, 1580, for example, Dandino informed Galli that Pucci had sent a letter from England to Bodley, and, on March 16, that he had succeeded in intercepting his reply to Pucci.[123] In Dandino's correspondence with Galli, the last information on Bodley's relationship with the group of Italian exiles was dated June 1580;[124] however, nothing prevents us from believing that this relationship continued. Certainly some of Wolf's editorial choices suggest an interest in radical thought.[125] After *Informatione della religione christiana* by Pucci, he published *Una essortatione al timor di Dio* by Jacopo Aconcio in 1580, and perhaps one of those "3 o 4 libri eretici portati dall'Italia" that Castelvetro wanted to have

119 On Jacopo Castelvetro, see: Firpo 1979, *Castelvetro*.

120 Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, p. 239.

121 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*. As far as I know, there are very few specific studies on this period of Bodley's life and his relationships with exiles. See: Trim 1998, *Sir Thomas*; Clennell 2002, *Bodley*.

122 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, pp. 662, 667–668.

123 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, pp. 611, 621.

124 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, p. 679.

125 On John Wolf's editorial policy, see, for example: McLean 2009, *Alberico Gentili*, pp. 294–300.

printed in England.[126] In 1580, Alberico Gentili, the famous Italian jurist, also arrived in London, obliged to leave his own country because of his Lutheran sympathies. He was in contact with Sir Philip Sidney, Thomas Bodley, and John Wolf, editor of some of his works, including the second edition of *De iure belli*.[127] However, Gentili was an adherent of the Italian Church in London and expressed negative judgments on radical reformers. Nevertheless, in *De Papatu Romano Antichristo*, written between 1582 and 1583, Gentili took a strongly anti-Roman position, renewing the controversy against the Pope-Antichrist and, above all, suggesting a need to simplify dogma. He outlined a suggestion for a more democratic organization of the Church, not dissimilar from some of Pucci's ideas.[128]

Pucci arrived in England for the second time about ten years after abandoning business to devote himself to religious studies (in Lyon in 1570) and about eight years after leaving the Catholic Church (as a consequence of being horrified by the massacre of the night of St. Bartholomew that took place in Paris in August 1572). Pucci had finished his studies and, as Luigi Firpo wrote,[129] was sure of having discovered the truth, which he now had to proclaim to all Christendom. The *Informatione della religione christiana* had two specific aims: the first was to propose a summary of Christianity from a definition of fundamental concepts (God, creation, original sin, etc.) to the significance of sacraments and rites.[130] The second aim was to carry out the long-awaited Reformation of Christianity, the true Reformation that the Roman Anti-Christ had prevented. For this reason, Pucci invocated a universal council and announced the imminent advent of the Millennium. The book was only 11 by 7.5 cm so that it could travel secretly. It was addressed to Italian exiles all over Europe (which is why it was written in Italian) and to those who had remained in Italy and were obliged to hide their faith. However, Pucci wanted to reach a more universal public, as he said in the opening letter *Ai lettori vaghi del vero*.[131] In fact, his book was part of a plan to convene all true Christians scattered everywhere throughout Europe, the large community of men,

126 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, p. 704.

127 Gentili 1589, *De jure*.

128 See: Quaglioni 2009, *Il De papatu*. On Alberico Gentili, see: Panizza 1970, *Machiavelli*; Panizza 1981, *Alberico Gentili*; Borrelli 1986, *Tecniche*; Panizza 1988, *Alberico Gentili*; Panizza (ed.) 2002, *Alberico Gentili*; Lavenia 2009, *Alberico Gentili*; Lavenia (ed.) 2015, *Alberico Gentili*.

129 Firpo 1967, *Nuove ricerche*, p. 1070.

130 An analysis of *Informatione* in Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 43–67.

131 Pucci 1580, *Informatione*, pp. 3–10 (Now see: Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 89–90).

spatially separated but united in the spirit of the Gospel, who could prepare a universal council from below, an event the Papal Court wanted to avoid at all costs. Pucci announced a simple truth: a belief that the notion of God is clearly expressed in nature and in the human mind. It is enough to follow the light of reason and to trust in God's love to solve religious controversies and to save all mankind. This was the core of religion described in *Informatione della religione christiana*, a religion without mysteries, corresponding to the "miglior filosofia di tutte le nationi del mondo."[132]

Pucci's plan did not arise entirely from the mind of a solitary dreamer, since he could rely on the help of many friends in promoting the attempt. The roads followed by the copies of the *Informatione* throughout Europe suggest the existence of a network of people who were able to distribute books and support ideas. On December 23, 1579, the papal nuncio in Paris, Anselmo Dandino, informed Cardinal Tolomeo Galli that a small book had been printed in England "assai cattivo."[133] On January 31, he added that 500 copies had been put into a bale containing textiles, and addressed to Ferrara and Venice.[134] Soon after, on February 25, he wrote instructions to intercept a packet that contained copies of *Informatione* for Jacopo Corbinelli, who has to consign them to a friend who was a bookseller in Paris.[135] Four days later, Dandino expressed concern regarding the relationships between Pucci and Thomas Bodley, and provided the news that 300 copies of *Informatione* had arrived in Lyon in the hands of the Florentine captain Giovanni Battista Sassetti. Others had arrived in Padua, perhaps delivered to Richard Cox, the bishop of Ely.[136] Around mid-February, Francesco Maria Gondi, a friend of Pucci who was also close to Francis Walsingham, arrived in England from Paris. Soon after, Gondi returned to Paris, where he met Corbinelli and Bodley. At the end of May he left for Rome, where his uncle Leonardo lived, with a packet that probably contained copies of *Informatione*.[137] Perhaps Jacopo Castelvetro also participated in efforts to distribute the book; after meeting him, Francesco Betti thanked Corbinelli for Pucci's book, since it had not arrived in Basel until then, although some copies were available in Frankfurt.[138] On July 13, the British ambassador in

132 Pucci 1580, *Informatione*, p. 5; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, p. 89.

133 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, p. 567.

134 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, p. 502n.

135 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, p. 609.

136 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, p. 611. See also: Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, p. 34.

137 Cloulas (ed.) 1970, *Correspondence*, pp. 677, 679.

138 « Emmi stato oltre modo caro il libretto che ella m'ha mandato del Puccio » (Carta 2012, *Il nostro allievo*, p. 239).

Paris, Henry Cobban, asked William Waad for a "half-dozen of Francisco Puchi's book published and printed in England," probably to distribute them.[139] The involvement of Waad is particularly interesting because he was an informer of William Cecil, and Pucci was very close to Cecil during his stays in England. In fact, Pucci later dedicated a copy of his last book to Cecil, which was printed in 1592 in the Netherlands with the title of *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*.[140] Additional copies of *Informatione* continued to appear, even in Krakow. On December 3, 1580, Fausto Sozzini gave information about Pucci to Andreas Dudith in Wrocław and annexed a copy of the small book to his letter as a sample of the "novam quandam theologiam."[141]

The intervention of censorship was very effective. Most copies were withdrawn from circulation and destroyed, so that only three of them survive (as far as we know) in the public libraries of Europe.[142] However, it is difficult to argue that the *Informatione* was the work of an isolated man. The anonymous *Forma d'una republica catholica*, written during the same period, strengthens this idea and can be considered a completion of the plan, carried out by Pucci and his friends, to start a great reformation of Christendom. The *Forma* is preserved today only by Manuscript 925 in the Sloane collection at the British Library. It was partially printed for the first time in the twentieth century by Delio Cantimori, and later by Luigi Firpo.[143] The work is composed of two parts that are related yet independent from each other. The first part opens with a letter to "all lovers of the truth" and is divided into 15 chapters; the second, titled *Disciplina domestica*, opens with a letter to "pious reader" and is divided into 12 unnumbered sections, each with a title. In the opening letter, the anonymous author claims the need for a universal council, promoted from below, in order to "rivedere da capo a piede tutta la religione," since the number of those who are separated in spirit from ecclesiastical domination was great enough to form a populous republic.[144] The following chapters explained the identities of the citizens of the underground republic, their beliefs, and how they were organized.[145] The *Disciplina domestica*, after a summary of the fundamental

139 Butler (ed.) 1904, *Calendar*, p. 374. See: Carta 2012, *Il nostro allievo*, p. 239.

140 See: Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 134–135.

141 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, p. 147.

142 They are preserved in Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan und Dombibliothek Köln, and Zentralbibliothek Zürich.

143 See: *supra*, p. 48n111.

144 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 263–264.

145 That is: organization and functioning of the colleges, the offices necessary for their proper functioning, the marriages, the upbringing of children, the customs, and so on (Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 265–285).

articles of faith which resumed some of the principles expounded in the first chapters of the *Informatione*,[146] explained how the domestic life of these communities should be organized, including their morals, prayers, sacraments, and marriages.[147] *Forma* is a normative text like others used by the communities of exiles in England,[148] but in this case it was a secluded community without a precise location or institutional recognition. Strictly speaking, the text does not describe a utopia,[149] since it is a plan to be put into practice concretely and quickly. Although the main historiographical tradition considers this work to be the result of "rebellion of an isolated but enterprising and also imaginative man against the dogmatic and disciplinary rigidity of the churches of exiles in England,"[150] it is more likely a collective work, as Giorgio Radetti had already supposed in 1940.[151] The ideas and language of Pucci often recur in this work (especially in the *Somma della nostra credenza e fede*),[152] but they may be either quotations from the *Informatione* or contributions by Pucci himself. On the other hand, the *Informatione*, published a few months earlier, is never mentioned in the *Forma* (and the *Forma* is never mentioned in Pucci's other work or letters). Moreover, meticulous attention to practical aspects of everyday life is uncommon in Pucci's work, and there are also some differences between the principles already expounded in the *Informatione*. Most importantly, in *Forma* there is no trace of the expectation of the Millennium, which is the *raison d'être* of his other work and a fundamental principle of Pucci's thought during those years.[153] During this second stay in England, Pucci was likely in touch with the Family of Love.[154] Perhaps, inside the same network of relationships that enabled a wide distribution of the *Informatione*, Pucci and others felt it was time to move into action and to promote a great council from below. The manuscript of the *Forma* ends with a mysterious acronym: "W.S.I.S.H.P.D.G.C.A.P".[155] Luigi Firpo supposed it was a Latin salutation.[156] Later Paolo Carta suggested

146 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 287–288.

147 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 288–298.

148 For example: Łaski 1555, *Forma ac ratio*. Pucci knew this work.

149 Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le periple*, p. 123.

150 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 200.

151 Radetti 1940, *Riformatori ed eretici*, p. 90. The same conviction in Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 69–74, and Carta 2012, *Il nostro allievo*.

152 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 287–288.

153 See: Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 69–74.

154 On the relationships between Pucci and the Family of Love in England, see: Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le periple*, pp. 130–134; Caravale 2011, *Il profeta*, pp. 96–99.

155 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 298.

156 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 298n.

that it might be a list of the author's initials, since "W" cannot correspond to a Latin word;[157] moreover, this practice was not uncommon among the Familists. We know that Pucci, after leaving England, went to Antwerp in March 1582, where the Family of Love was going through one of its better moments thanks to the work of the printer Christophe Plantin and the group gathered around him (Benito Arias Montano, and Adam Ortelius).[158] Pucci likely met Justus Lipsius in Antwerp, who also belonged to the Family of Love and was later in correspondence with the Florentine.[159] While in Antwerp Pucci wrote to Fausto Sozzini "ex sessione XXXV concilii peregrinantium Christianorum,"[160] a mysterious indication of an underground organization that we cannot dismiss as a mere figment of his imagination.[161]

The *Informatione della religione christiana* and the *Forma d'una republica cattolica* are closely related, two parts of a single plan, with Pucci as its main author. Both works were written against the Papal Court. The first is characterized by a rebellious spirit against the Pope "anti-Christ," while the second focuses on building a secret alternative church. Both works are based on the firm belief that every deep renovation must arise from a universal council from below, because the hierarchy of the Roman Church does not want to lose its worldly power. In the *Informatione* Pucci says that even a small group of true Christians can start this great event "perché Dio, che accompagna et favorisce quelli che per amor suo si adunano, insegnerebbe a quel santo drappello il modo di sbrigarsi delle difficultà";[162] the *Forma*, on the other hand, manifested the certainty that a large number of true Christians already existed secluded from the Church "ch'e' possono fare una repubblica assai popolata."[163] Some months after publishing the *Informatione*, it seemed possible to carry out Pucci's plan, which is why I think the *Forma* may have been the result of a collective work, behind which we can imagine the hopes and expectations of an organized group that believed it was possible to change the course of history. *Informatione* and *Forma*, in Pucci's mind, were not utopian visions but works

157 Carta 2012, *Il nostro allievo*, pp. 240–241.

158 On the relationships between Pucci and the Family of Love in Antwerp and Netherlands, see: Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le periple*, pp. 140–157.

159 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 325–328.

160 Fausto Sozzini to Matteo Radecke, January 8, 1586, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, II, p. 379; Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, p. 175.

161 Alastair Hamilton included the *Forma* in a current Familist and Rosicrucian (Hamilton 1980, *The Family*, p. 164n). See also: Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le periple*, pp. 141–157; Caravale 2011, *Il profeta*, p. 97.

162 Pucci 1580, *Informatione*, p. 9; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, p. 90.

163 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 263.

of action. Today, we know that these works represented an unrealistic expectation and there was no universal council from below at the end of the century in Europe, only blood and wars. Nevertheless, the unfulfilled expectations, when arising from real needs, are equally interesting to reconstruct the dynamics of history. They reveal an underground world peopled by Nicodemites, Anabaptists, and other radicals that provided major contributions to the formation of our modern civilization.

Pucci left the Netherlands, and later Germany, full of disappointment. He later went to Krakow, where he debated with Fausto Sozzini on the immortality of Adam (1583–1585). Pucci's trust in a deep change from below had been lost; even among Lutherans and Calvinists he had found few lovers of truth. He was convinced that the awaited universal council and the forthcoming great reformation could have been carried out only by the two leaders of Christendom, the Pope and the Emperor, a renovation from above, rather than from below. Pucci spent six years in Prague (1585–1591), the seat of the Empire, where he abjured his previous errors and returned to the Catholic Church. Finally, he headed to Rome, the seat of the Catholic Church, with the goal of convincing the Pope of his great plans for reformation. Before arriving, however, he was arrested in Salzburg and transferred to Rome. Only then was he forced to realize that his expectations had become a utopia. Pucci was imprisoned and tried for heresy. On July 5, 1597 he was beheaded in Tor di Nona and his body burned in Campo dei Fiori.

CHAPTER 3

Toleration and Adam's Immortality: An Example of the Relationship between Locke and the Socinians

3.1 The Immortality of Adam and the Breadth of the Kingdom of God in Locke's Writings

Among Locke's manuscripts in the Lovelace Collection, the volume marked *Ms. Locke c. 27* comprises a *Christianae religionis brevis delineatio* dating to 1702.[1] During this period Locke had withdrawn to the peace of Oates in Essex where he was living with the Masham family, devoting himself to biblical exegesis on the epistles of St. Paul[2] and preparing his defence against the charges of Socinianism made by John Edwards following the publication of *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. The *Brevis delineatio* is an extremely concise work in which Locke briefly expounds on the main themes of his theological thought: sin, death, law, and redemption. It consists of an organic series of notes probably written during the same years of the paraphrasing of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. The function of such notes explains the radical selection of the arguments and renders each of them indispensable. The series of propositions is opened by a postulate about the nature of the first man: "Man created after the Image of god i.e. Immortal (*Gen* 1, 26–27 and 3, 19)."[3] Not only does Locke expound in a lapidary manner the idea of the substantial immortality of Adam, he also supports the argument of man's likeness to the Creator through the confirmation given in Genesis 1:26–27. Genesis 3:19 emphasizes that the punishment for sin is death. In *The Reasonableness*, written seven years prior, he made the same decision to focus on the nature of the first man in relation to sin; there too it was this argument with which he opened the volume. Locke justifies this decision by stressing how "to understand therefore

1 The text was first published by Sina 1972, *Testi*, pp. 416–418. Here I use the text included in Locke 2002, *Writings*, pp. 242–244.

2 The writings on St. Paul's epistles were published posthumously in Locke 1707, *A Paraphrase*. The parts concerning, respectively, the epistle to the Galatians and the first epistle to the Corinthians had already been published in 1705 and 1706. I have used the edition Locke 1987, *A Paraphrase*.

3 See: Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 242.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004335783_004

what we are restored to by Jesus Christ, we must consider what the Scripture shews we lost by *Adam.*"[4] This is not a bold choice, since in the Christian theological tradition, from the Council of Orange in 529 against the Semipelagians up to the Council of Trent, a very close link had been established between the questions of the nature of Adam, sin and redemption, so much so that Christ is referred to as "the second Adam," as he restores the state of sanctity and inner righteousness lost by man. This is an issue of crucial importance in Locke's thought, especially in view of its implications on the debate about the existence and immortality of the individual soul that engaged him during the last years of his life.[5] For this reason too, the most curious aspect is that, despite its pivotal importance, the solutions furnished by Locke do not appear uniform.[6]

In *Homo ante et post lapsum*, another manuscript from the Lovelace Collection that can be dated to around 1693, the question of Adam's nature is resolved in a manner diametrically opposed to that of the *Brevis delineatio* of 1702.[7] Here Locke states that: "Man was made mortal."[8] He speaks of a state of "endless life" that God allowed the first mortal man, a state that would have endured if man, through his transgression, had not been banished from earthly paradise and unable to eat the fruits of the tree of life.[9] This was the condition for all of posterity which, excluded from the earthly paradise and the tree of life, was doomed to a common fate of aging and death. Locke had not begun to write *The Reasonableness*, which he probably only commenced in the winter of 1694, completing it in May of the following year. In *The Reasonableness*, his position appears to be more vague and contradictory, to the extent of raising potential exegetical questions. As we have seen, *The Reasonableness* opens by stating the problem of Adam's condition. Locke's interpretation of Genesis 2:17 is literal, not metaphorical: "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," meaning that the punishment for eating the forbidden fruit was literally death; in other words, it alluded to Adam's loss of his privileged position

4 Locke 1695, *The Reasonableness*. Here I use the text included in Locke 2002, *Writings*, pp. 85–210.

5 The problem is addressed directly by Pitassi 1992, *Anima*. The question has also been dealt with by Giuntini 2005, *Il corpo*, pp. 187–215.

6 Locke's fluctuations on the immortality of Adam are identified by Pitassi 1992, *Anima*, pp. 96–98, even though she tends to stress the continuity of his soteriological thought.

7 The difference between the opinions expressed in *Brevis delineatio* and in *Homo ante et post lapsum* is pointed out, but not explained, by Victor Nuovo in Locke 2002, *Writings*, LVI.

8 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 231.

9 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 231: "For though he was made mortal yet the tree of life should after having observed this probationary law to a sufficient testimony of his obedience have clothed him upon with immortality without dying."

that had rendered him immune. The consequence of the offence is not metaphysical like that of original sin, which is transferred to all humanity from the moment of birth, affecting individuals even when they are still innocent. This would contradict all reasonableness, particularly the principle of individual responsibility. Sin results in the loss of a benefit, which forces all the descendants of Adam to live in a new less favorable condition without any prospect of immortality up to the advent of Christ. Adam did not really die after having eaten the forbidden fruit, "but was turned out of Paradise from the Tree of Life, and shut out for ever from it, lest he should take thereof and live for ever."[10] Locke infers that in the earthly paradise he enjoyed a condition "of Life without end." This is a concept similar to that of the Socinians which implies the mortal nature of the first man, as was unequivocally written in the text of 1593. It is, however, inconsistent with what the author later says in *The Reasonableness*.

The main purpose of *The Reasonableness* was to demonstrate the conformity of the Gospel to natural law, although they are kept quite separate from each other and the revelation and divine inspiration of the Scriptures is acknowledged. After the initial reflection on the nature of Adam, Locke proceeds to a careful examination of the New Testament sources in order to maintain that the only article of faith indispensable to salvation is acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah as prophesied by the prophets. This is one of the most radical attempts at doctrinal simplification ever made since the sixteenth century. It represents the natural outcome of Locke's deep interest in theological thought which, as has been shown,[11] emerged in the years of his journey through France in 1675 and continued during his stay in Holland in 1683 as a result of his relations with the Remonstrants.[12] It also explains the intensive exegetical studies of the last period of his life. His position provoked numerous accusations, especially from those who feared that it could pave the way to an association between reason and faith and the transformation of Christianity into a moral discipline, such as deism. In reality, during the course of the sixteenth century, the reduction of the articles of faith coincided with the attempt to justify the principle of toleration on not only juridical but also theological bases. From this point of view, Locke's meditation appears as the last in a series of radical attempts at doctrinal simplification undertaken, in the wake of Erasmus, by numerous exponents of the sixteenth-century radical reformation such as Celio Secondo Curione, Giorgio Siculo, Francesco Pucci

10 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 92.

11 See: Pitassi 1990, *Le Philosophe*.

12 On the relations between Locke and the Arminians during his stay in Holland, see: Simonutti 2005, *Fausto Sozzini*.

and Tommaso Campanella. Their need to conceive of a God who gathers to himself the whole of mankind, without distinctions between visible churches, belongs to the cultural baggage of Locke, and can be explained by Locke's relations with the latitudinarians of the Tew Circle, the Socinians and Arminians, such as Boyle, van Limborch, and Le Clerc.[13] This need clearly emerges in the second part of *The Reasonableness*.

Having concluded his analysis of the New Testament passages that persuaded him that "These two, Faith and Repentance, i.e. believing Jesus to be the *Messiah*, and a good Life, are the indispensible Conditions of the New Covenant to be performed by all those who would obtain Eternal Life,"[14] and before directly addressing the question of redemption, Locke returns to the issue of the nature of Adam, recalling the opening pages of his book. Here he advances a significantly different position; he claims that Adam—a son of God—was immortal, since this was a feature of being in the likeness of the Father.[15] A little further on he reinforces this idea, setting up a relation between Adam and Jesus based on the fact that they are the two direct sons of God and, as such, represent the image of the Creator.[16] It is precisely the analysis of the words "likeness" and "image" that enables him to sustain his idea that immortality is a characteristic shared with the Father. There are no references to the preclusion of the tree of life, which establishes a direct relation between the nourishment of its fruits and Adam's endless life. Instead, Adam's immortality seems to be a naturally acquired quality as a direct son of God. The latter, in his infinite mercy, wished to offer man eternal life by sending Jesus Christ into the world. It is on the basis of this likeness that Locke sustains the fullness of the Messianic role of Jesus Christ, who offers men the chance to again become like their Father if they adhere to the new covenant. In the following chapters, on the strength of the argument derived from this postulate, Locke first proves the scriptural grounds of the necessity of works, and not just faith, for the achievement of salvation (hence, salvation also depends on abiding by a moral law

13 On English and continental sources of Socinianism in Locke's thought, see: Simonutti 2005, *John Locke*.

14 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 199.

15 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 199: "*Adam* being the Son of God, and so St. *Luke* calls him, *Chap*. III, 38. had this part also of the *Likeness* and *Image* of the Father, *viz*. That he was Immortal."

16 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 200: "And that Immortality is a part of the *Image*, wherein these (who were the immediate Sons of God, so as to have no other Father) were made like their Father, appears probable, not only from the places in *Genesis* concerning *Adam*, above taken notice of, but seems to me also to be intimated in some Expressions concerning *Jesus*, the Son of God."

in which Jesus provided an example with his life and words). Jumping from scriptural exegesis to philosophical argument, Locke addresses the problem of the relationship between natural law and divine revelation, moving along the knife-edge separating radical naturalism, such as that of the deists, from the conviction that the new covenant confirms the principles of natural law without detracting from the importance of revelation.[17] Behind this attempt we can perceive Locke's desire to reject Augustinianism in the forms that it had historically assumed in the visible churches, in particular the metaphysical sense of original sin as a stain condemning ranks of guiltless human beings, and the dogma of predestination. This is a further stage in the debate on the question of the extent of the reign of God that pervades European thought on toleration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was precisely this question that, beneath the dried-up confessional structure of the churches, became one of the channels through which theological language was nourished by the ferment engendered by the spread of a new idea of reason in which the old notion of the unity of Christendom was replaced by a broader secular principle of universal brotherhood. Locke arrives at making radical proposals in *The Reasonableness*, even though he later specifies their limitations, partially retracing his steps in an attempt to avoid charges of Socinianism and deism, which turned out to be in vain. He addresses the question of what lies in store for those who, having no knowledge of the promises of the ancient covenant or of the teachings of the Messiah, cannot meet the requirements that he maintains are essential for salvation (namely, believing in Jesus as the Messiah and following his example). His response to this is a proposal of striking breadth:

> Yet God had, by the Light of Reason, revealed to all mankind, who would make use of that Light, that he was Good and Merciful. The same spark of the Divine Nature and Knowledge in Man, which making him a man, shewed him the Law he was under as a Man; Shewed him also the way of Attoning the merciful, kind, compassionate Author and Father of him and his Being, when he had transgressed that Law. He that made use of this Candle of the Lord, so far as to find what was his Duty, could not

17 The concern to remain within these confines is expressed from the very first words of *The Reasonableness* (Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 91): "This I thought worthy of a diligenter and unbiassed search: Since I found the two Extreams, that Men run into on this Point, either on the one hand shook the Foundations of all Religion, or on the other made Christianity almost nothing."

> miss to find also the way to Reconciliation and Forgiveness, when he had failed of his Duty.[18]

In the final analysis, this "Candle of the Lord," which shines in every man as the spark of his divine nature, is sufficient to light the path to salvation.

The connection between this issue and the question of Adam's immortality is not obvious, yet the appearance of the two subjects together at several strategic points in the work suggests a link. It seems highly improbable that the divergences between the ideas about the nature of Adam expressed at the beginning of *The Reasonableness* and those formulated in the central section of the work are the result of carelessness, all the more so since *The Reasonableness* is chronologically placed between the two manuscripts of 1693 and of 1702 (*Homo ante et post lapsum* and *Christianae religionis brevis delineatio* respectively), illustrating opposite positions on the subject. These elements tend to suggest an evolution of Locke's thought on the question in parallel with a growing awareness of its importance.

3.2 Adam, Locke and the Socinians

The issue of Adam's immortality plays an important role in the theological thought of the Socinians. Even though Locke publicly denied any inclination to Socinianism, to the point of declaring that he had never read any of their books, his sympathies clearly emerge from his documents and works.[19] The fact that he nourished doubts about the divinity of Christ, for example, appears to be confirmed by one of the manuscript texts from the Lovelace Collection, where he brings together around twenty biblical passages to sustain the argument of "Christus merus homo," resulting in one (specifically *1 Pet* 1, 11) that supports "Christus non merus homo."[20] The same process is repeated for textual verification of the concept of the Trinity. Furthermore, his debt towards certain fundamental works of the Socinian tradition is stressed, for example in the *De Sacrae Scripturae Auctoritate* by Fausto Sozzini,[21] which addresses the relationship between revealed truth and reason, and identifies objective rules for a correct scriptural exegesis, which do not substantially diverge from those used

18 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 190.

19 See on this subject: Firpo 1980, *John Locke*; Marshall 2000, *Locke*; Simonutti 2005, *John Locke*.

20 Pitassi 1994, *Le Christ*, p. 106.

21 See Alfredo Sabetti's introduction in Locke 1976, *La ragionevolezza*, CVII.

to analyze any other book. Elsewhere Sozzini defends his opinion that human reason needs to perceive divine revelation[22] or that the latter can reveal truths beyond the limits of reason, but not contrary to it. This notion prefigures the distinction between *reason* and *above reason* that was to mark the progress of European thought towards the birth of the reason of the Enlightenment, and underlies the thought of Locke.[23] We know that Locke had already encountered Socinian works through the translations of John Biddle[24] during his stay at Exeter House and later at Thanet House. There were also numerous Socinian texts in his library. In addition to the weighty *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* containing the doctrinal *corpus* of Socinianism made up of works by Fausto Sozzini (the first two volumes), Johannes Crell (four volumes), Jonas Schlichting (two volumes) and Johann Ludwig Wolzogen (two volumes), there were other editions of single works by Sozzini (eight books), Johannes Crell (nine books), Johannes Völkel (two books), and Samuel Crell (one book), to mention but a few.[25] The evidence is sufficient to demonstrate that Locke's interest in Socinianism was neither general nor accidental, but derived from a specific affinity of thought.[26]

In at least one case we have evidence of the care he took in analyzing these works. Among the manuscripts collected in volume *c. 27* of the Lovelace Collection, there is a series of notes in Locke's own hand on several passages of the *De vera religione* by Johannes Völkel,[27] one of the most important works of Socinian theology in the seventeenth century.[28] Here Locke does not expound on his own observations, but rather summarizes the contents of Völkel's text.

---

22 For example, in *Adversus eos qui rerum ad salutem suam aeternam pertinentiam, cognitionem, diligenter per se ipsi non inquirunt* (Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 343): "Nam ubi divina patefactio adest, non solum humana ratio res divinas percipere potest, sed ut percipiat, necesse est; alioqui frustra plane esset patefactio ista." See: Cantimori 2002, *Eretici*, 351–352.

23 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, II, p. 617: "Verum multa quidem divinitus patefiunt supra rationem et humanum captum, nihil tamen contra rationem sensumque ipsum communem" (in Fausto Sozzini's *Responsio ad libellum Jacobi Wuieki jesuitae, Polonice editum, De divinitate Filii Dei et Spiritus Sancti*). About the development of the Enlightenment idea of reason, see: Sina 1976, *L'avvento*.

24 See: Simonutti 2005, *John Locke*, pp. 220–225.

25 The catalogue of John Locke's library is published in Harrison/Laslett 1965, *The library*.

26 However, several significant theological differences prove that, notwithstanding his inclinations, Locke cannot be defined as a Socinian. See: Ogonowski 1972, *Locke*, p. 300.

27 See: Sina 1972, *Testi*, pp. 424–427.

28 Völkel 1630, *De vera religione*. Also in Locke's library was the Groningen edition of 1651 with the confutation by Samuel Maresius (Harrison/Laslett 1965, *The library*, p. 260).

It is, however, significant that Locke's attention dwells once again on the question of the original nature of Adam. The notes refer to several passages of the first chapter and begin with the words: "Homo factus mortalis" (1 Cor 15:45). Taking up a position previously sustained by Fausto Sozzini, Völkel emphatically denies the immortal nature of the first man. His words are peremptory: "Ex iis, quae hactenus a nobis disputata sunt, aperte colligitur, non solum in magno errore illos versari, sed in Christum etiam iniurios esse, qui primos parentes nostros immortales creatos fuisse contendunt,"[29] going on to cite 1 Cor 15:45. He maintains that the merit of having introduced immortality into the world is to be attributed to Christ alone. If man had enjoyed such a nature before his coming, or indeed from his very origins, then this would undermine the significance of Christ's task. This solution admits no exceptions, because it lends itself to the denial of the divinity of Christ, and is therefore closely connected to the significance and the manner of redemption.

The thought of Fausto Sozzini, the acknowledged leader of the movement, features no hesitations or developments on this subject. Among his works in Locke's library was, for example, the *Christianae Religionis brevissima Institutio.*[30] Left unfinished at his death, it was channeled by his followers (Moskorzewski, Schmalz, Stoiński, and Völkel) into the Raków Catechism that was published in Polish in 1605. This is an educational work that explains the fundamental principles of Socinianism in the form of a dialogue between a *magister* and a *discipulus*. The question "numquid naturaliter et per se non habet homo quidquam commune cum immortalitate" is followed by the clear-cut answer "Non habet."[31] To the disciple who asks why, the teacher explains that man "quia etiam de terra ab initio formatus, ob idque mortalis creatus est."[32] Again, in the very short *Summa Religionis Christianae*[33] published in 1611 together with *De Sacrae Scripturae Auctoritate* (another book well known to Locke), there are no appreciable changes. Even the words in which the concept is formulated are largely identical: "Homo quia est ex terra factus, natura sua mortalis et corruptioni subiectus; [...] ita ut, quod immortalitatem attinet, nihil illi cum Deo commune sit."[34] The uniformity of the stance leaves no room for doubt. It is an argument too closely bound to the question of the

29 Völkel 1630, *De vera religione*, II, 11, p. 66.

30 See: Harrison/Laslett 1965, *The library*, p. 235.

31 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 651.

32 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 651.

33 Locke was able to read this in the first volume of Fausti Socini Senensis, *Opera*. See: Harrison/Laslett 1965, *The library*, p. 235.

34 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 281.

non-divine nature of Christ, the essential principle of Anti-trinitarianism, to allow any interpretative wavering. We have seen that Locke revealed an appreciation of such positions, arriving at conclusions very similar to those of Sozzini, listed above.[35] What remains an open question is why, from as far back as the *Reasonableness*—which Massimo Firpo considers "the most Socinian of his books"[36]—and in a definitive manner in the *Brevis Delineatio* of 1702, Locke defends a different, and later even opposing, position by sustaining the immortal nature of Adam.

3.3 The Debate Between Fausto Sozzini and Francesco Pucci on Adam's Immortality

The question of Adam's immortality has a specific origin in Fausto Sozzini's thought that can be clearly identified, even in chronological terms. He addresses it directly and profoundly for the first time in the course of his debate with the Italian exile Francesco Pucci, first in Basel in 1577, then in Krakow in November 1583.[37] The texts written during the Basel phase of the disputation were published posthumously in Raków by Moskorzewski in 1610 with the title *De statu primi hominis ante lapsum disputatio*, and were later collected, together with other works by Fausto Sozzini, in the second volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* which, as we know, Locke had in his library. They comprise not only the writings of Sozzini, but also those of his adversary.[38] In ten points, and on the basis of scriptural evidence, Pucci sustains the principle of the immortal nature of all creatures and particularly of Adam before sin. Sozzini refutes each of his opponent's arguments, defending the theory that the indefinite duration of life was lost as the result of the transgression of the first man in earthly paradise. This issue, which emerged during the course of a thoroughgoing

35 For example in *Homo ante et post lapsum* (1693). See *supra*, p. 58.

36 Firpo 1980, *John Locke*, p. 50.

37 On the dispute between Pucci and Sozzini, see: Firpo 1955, *Francesco Pucci a Basilea*, now also in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 67–96; Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 221–224; Biagioni 2005, *La ragione*.

38 See: Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, II, pp. 253–369. But now see: Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*. These are, in order, four writings of increasing length: Francesco Pucci, *Argumenta decem pro immortalitate rerum, praesertim vero hominis, in prima creatione*, pp. 7–11; Fausto Sozzini, *Responsio ad superius scriptum qua argumenta pro immortalitate primi hominis in eo contenta breviter refelluntur*, pp. 11–29; Francesco Pucci, *Suorum argumentorum Defensio adversus superiorem responsionem*, pp. 29–53; Fausto Sozzini, *Copiosa Refutatio*, pp. 54–324.

debate between the two on all fundamental principles of faith, absorbed all their attention. The not purely theological nature of the question[39] made it one of the pivotal problems in the religious debate of the second half of the sixteenth century (the nature of man and of Christ, the significance of sin and of redemption, the immortality of the soul, and the value of faith and works). The contestants posited two different concepts of man:[40] Pucci's stance was close to generic Neoplatonic positions, while Sozzini's related to a naturalism of Aristotelian derivation. The observations advanced by Locke in the second part of *The Reasonableness* and in the *Brevis delineatio* regarding the problem of Adam's nature assume this tradition and appear to veer between the two positions. In the second of his *Argumenta decem*, for example, Pucci maintains that "necesse est, igitur, omnes res creatas fuisse immortales, praecipue hominem, qui est imago Dei," exploiting the likeness to the Father to prove the immortal nature of Adam.[41] The suggestive power of the argument of the "imago Dei" is one of the recurring themes of the debate and explains why it is refuted by the Socinians.[42] In Pucci's opinion, the world at its origin was the mirror of the Supreme Good, and the first man received the "spiraculum vitae"[43] directly from God: hence, it could not contain any trace of death, which is the epitome of the opposite of good. Only individual guilt leading to sin could corrupt this faultless world and render man, together with all other creatures, subject to corruption and pain.

Pucci's stance on the issue of Adam's immortality underpinned his belief in the saving efficacy of natural religion and a boundless universalism, both cornerstones of his thought. We already find them in the *Thesis* printed in January 1578 during the disputation with Sozzini in Basel. Here he maintains that "Totum genus humanum esse efficienter particeps beneficii Christi servatoris et redemptoris in ipso matris utero et innocentiae aetate" and that individuals

39 Thus Fausto Sozzini defines it ("non pura teologica") in his letter to Belisario Bulgarini dated October 30, 1577, see: Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, 2, p. 125.

40 Apropos Pucci, see: Biagioni 2007, *L'uomo*, pp. 162–64. Some general remarks on the anthropological implications of Fausto Sozzini's thought in Lorenzetti 1995, *L'antropologia*.

41 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 8: "In omnibus rebus creatis (praesertim in homine) fuit aliqua similitudo creatoris: nam hoc exigit analogia creatoris et creaturae: at nihil est magis dissimile quam mortale immortali."

42 See, for example, the passage from the *Summa Religionis cristianae* by Fausto Sozzini cited *supra*, p. 64.

43 See the third argument by Pucci in Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 8: "Sacrae literae testantur Deum primum inspirasse in faciem hominis spiraculum vitae et factum esse hominem in animam viventem, quibus verbis declaratur eius natura et hypostasis: haec autem quae ei tribuuntur pugnant ex diametro cum natura mortali."

who have reached the age of reason and judgment are provided with a natural knowledge of God which is enough to save them.[44] In the following years the same principles led him to challenge any restrictive solution to the question of salvation, in particular Augustinianism and the Calvinist predestination, in *De praedestinatione Dei* of 1589.[45] Instead, he proclaimed salvation for the whole of mankind, without distinctions of race or creed, in *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*, published in Gouda, Holland in 1592, before his trial for heresy in Rome.

The problem of salvation was not resolved in such ranging terms by Fausto Sozzini. The very foundations of his theological thought, which permitted him to reject the principle of the ontological nature of original sin, also prevented him from believing in the metaphysical nature of Christ's benefit[46] and, therefore, its efficacy *ipso facto* for the salvation of all mankind. The negation of the natural immortality of Adam was an essential argument supporting this position on original sin and was complementary to the negation of the divinity of Christ. Salvation and condemnation cannot violate the principle of individual responsibility. The strength of redemption is contained in the word of Christ, which indicates the path to be followed to achieve it. But then, what is the fate of all those who lived before Christ, or of those who live in parts of the world that his word has never reached, or of children who die before reaching the age of reason? These were weighty questions that Fausto Sozzini addressed with extreme coherence, denying any possibility of natural salvation. In the last chapter of the *Copiosa refutatio*, devoted to the refutation of the tenth of Pucci's arguments,[47] Sozzini leaves no room for doubt: "Per Dei igitur et Iesu Christi cognitionem nobis vita aeterna acquiritur. Verum huiusmodi cognitio non omnibus hominibus naturaliter data est, sed per Evangelii praedicationem iis tantum exhibetur quibus ipse Christus voluerit."[48] There is no physical

44 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, 1, p. 22.

45 Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*. In chapter XXV (p. 187), Pucci mentions the question of the salvation of recently discovered peoples. On this point see: Biagioni 2005, *La ragione*, p. 86.

46 These arguments are discussed by Sozzini in *De Iesu Christo servatore* (1594). See: Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, II, pp. 115–246.

47 These are Pucci's words (Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 10): "Si mors inerat hominibus ante peccatum et Messias nunquam dicitur attulisse remedium, nisi ei quae introivit per peccatum, restituisset nos ad statum utique mortalem, et filius Dei nullam solidam foelicitatem comparasset nobis sua morte et resurrectione, imo maneret ipse quoque adhuc mortalis, quatenus homo est; quo nihil dici potest absurdius et quod magis pugnet cum sacris literis."

48 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 289.

descent that can assure salvation, which can be reached only through faith in Christ's word. Thus, children who die prematurely are excluded because they are incapable of faith or of choosing between good and evil.[49] A similar fate awaits those who have never known the Gospel, such as the peoples that had recently been discovered in the New World. In a later work entitled *Praelectiones theologicae*, Sozzini begins by denying the immortal nature of Adam, and then, in the second chapter, proceeds to deny the possibility of a natural knowledge of God, providing as tangible proof the reports from lands "in novo occidentali orbe in Bresilia provincia," where entire races had been discovered "qui nullum penitus sensum aut suspicionem Divinitatis alicuius habent."[50]

Francesco Pucci's sojourn in Krakow between 1583 and 1585 and the revival of his controversy with Fausto Sozzini were not without important consequences. Some members of the *Ecclesia minor*, even among Fausto's closest followers, expressed strong reservations about some of his ideas,[51] while a degree of consensus began to emerge regarding the existence of natural religion. The printed edition of the *Disputatio*, which Sozzini had hoped would be rapidly produced,[52] was not actually published until after his death, after having raised numerous doubts, especially on the points discussed above. Illustrations of such dissent can be found in the correspondence of Sozzini to Johannes Völkel, one of his closest disciples, who showed a particular interest in the texts of *Disputatio*. He was in possession of a manuscript copy[53] that he subjected to careful analysis in the second half of the nineties while he was living in the community of Filipów in the duchy of Lithuania. In a letter dated October 7, 1596, Völkel expresses his doubts on the reasons that induced Sozzini to refrain from openly defending the immortality of individual soul, almost as if the negation of the natural immortality of Adam prevented him from doing otherwise.[54] Even more incisive are the objections made against the arguments in the tenth chapter dealing with the salvation of children and the death of the godless. This is why Völkel declares that he does not approve of the publication

49 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 300: "Quare in eam absurditatem devenias necesse est ut dicas [. . .] infantes omnes propria fide praeditos esse."

50 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 538.

51 See: Biagioni 2005, *La ragione*, pp. 69–85.

52 Fausto Sozzini to Johannes Völkel, Krakow, November 16, 1596, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 454: "Spero enim eius editionem non diu dilatum iri."

53 This was, most probably, the copy that Hieronim Moskorzewski used for the first edition of the *Disputatio*, published at Raków in 1610 (see: Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, pp. 222–223).

54 Fausto Sozzini to Johann Völkel, Krakow, November 16, 1596, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 454.

of the *Disputatio*, since it contains various assertions that "a multis sine magna offensione tum nostris tum alienis legi non possint."[55] Sozzini's remains resolute. He defends his ideas on the fate of the godless, even though they may be unpalatable to others, since "quicquid sit veritas, patefacienda est." In the same way he defends his assertions about the fate of infants, which Völkel feared could be judged too harsh, sustaining that this is an irrefutable consequence of the absence of faith, it being certain that "Puccium infantibus, studio suo inquirendi de ipsorum salute, prodesse non posse."[56] However, Sozzini's clarifications were not sufficient to completely convince Völkel and those like him who were uncomfortable with the links binding the negation of Adam's immortality, the rejection of all forms of natural religion and the question of salvation.

3.4 The Issue of Adam's Immortality in Socinian Thought After Fausto Sozzini

Johannes Völkel occupies an important position in the history of Socinianism, primarily because he wrote *De vera religione*, a weighty doctrinal synthesis that, as we have seen,[57] represented a benchmark for at least two generations of disciples and, later, exiles, until the volumes of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* were published in Amsterdam beginning in 1688. Despite the intense expectation surrounding the publication of the *De vera religione*, which was to have represented a faithful reconstruction of the religious thought of Fausto Sozzini, it did not come out until twelve years after the death of its author, and only after the editors had revised all the sections dealing with natural religion.[58] Regarding the question of Adam's immortality, there are no substantial divergences from the ideas of Sozzini. Völkel devotes ample space to the issues addressed in the *Disputatio*, carefully reutilizing some of Sozzini's arguments and defending the principle that our original ancestors had no immortal nature. At the same time, however, he does not attribute to the question of the status of a fundamental premise for a correct understanding of Christian religion. In fact, Völkel discusses this argument only in the eleventh chapter of the second part, which is devoted to the promise of eternal life contained in

55 Fausto Sozzini to Johannes Völkel, Krakow, March 8, 1597, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 455.

56 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, p. 455.

57 See: *supra* p. 63.

58 This is underlined by Skrzypek 2005, *Une dissertation*, p. 470.

the teachings of Christ. There is no trace of it in the opening pages, not even where the creation of man is discussed.[59]

Evidence of the considerable difficulties encountered by the *De vera religione* before arriving at the presses is also to be found in the introduction by Johannes Crell, who prepared the final version for printing.[60] After recalling the controversies aroused by the author's original arrangement of arguments,[61] Crell explains that he did not want to distort Völkel's work, so had simply added an initial section entitled *De Deo et eius attributis*. In actual fact, the work inserted by Crell in the *De vera religione* is one of the most innovative contributions to the Socinian theological tradition since it very clearly sustains the existence of natural religion.[62] From the very first chapter Crell declares, in opposition to Sozzini's ideas, that "Deum esse ex universa natura demonstratur."[63] He then proceeds to present proof of the existence of God—who governs the world and to whom all men owe worship and homage—not through divine revelation or theology, but rather through reason alone, exploiting the categories of Aristotelian physics. In the third chapter he proposes to demonstrate, through cosmological argument, that "huius universi aliquem esse opificem, seu causam efficientem, intelligentia consilioque praeditam, quam nos Creatorem appellamus."[64] The logical consequence of such argument is the conviction that even men far removed from the preaching of the Gospel and ignorant of the Holy Scriptures possess a natural knowledge of God. Despite the reports of certain peoples recently discovered in the New

59 There is an indirect mention of it in book II, chapter VI: "Ad hominis creationem quod attinet, tametsi eum non minus quam alia animantia ex terra Deus constituit, tamen eum omnium terrestrium naturarum praestantissimam esse, tum ex eo constat, quod Deus illo in lucem edito ab omnibus operibus suis conquievit, nequaquam conquieturus, si excellentior adhuc creatura fabricanda fuisset, tum quod in eo suam imaginem impressisse, una cum Mose alii etiam divini scriptores testificantur" (Völkel 1630, *De vera religione*, p. 9).

60 Crell had to rearrange the first book (see: Bock 1774, *Historia*, p. 999). On the birth of *De vera religione* see: Ogonowski 1966, *Socynianizm*, pp. 90–91.

61 "Non defuerunt qui ordinem operis Volkeliani alicubi mutandum et quae auctor libro quinto tractasset, a se invicem divulsa, locis magis propriis sparsim inserenda putarent" (*Iohannes Crellius Ecclesiae Racoviensis Minister Christiano Lectori salute*, in Völkel 1630, *De vera religione*, c. 3r).

62 See: Ogonowski 1974, *Le rationalisme*, pp. 152–54.

63 Crell 1630, *De Deo*, p. 2. This first part consists of the *De deo et eius attributis* by Crell and has its own separate page numbering. In the second part (corresponding to the first book of Völkel's original work) numbering begins again from page 1.

64 Crell 1630, *De Deo*, p. 9.

World who appeared to have no religion, "tamen longe plures fuerunt reperti in quibus divinitatis opinio extitit, licet alias barbari essent et ab humanitatis cultu alieni."[65] Moreover, history teaches us that even people without any opinion about God worshipped and feared demons, and this too, albeit corrupted and mistaken, is a kind of religion. In fact, the knowledge of God comes directly from the intellect; without intellect there can be no "religionis sensus." However, this occurs in beasts and in those that barbarism has reduced to the condition of beasts. It is a profession of trust in the reasonableness of religion and in the conformity of the notion of God with the very nature of human intellect.

The subject of Adam, and its connections with the questions of the breadth of the kingdom of God and with toleration, continued to be at the center of the European religious and philosophical debate during the seventeenth century.[66] The most famous example was the publication in 1655 of the *Preadamites* by Isaac LaPeyrère, considered by some to be an extreme latitudinarian, and by others a forerunner of theories on race. Probably less well known but equally significant is the work of Samuel Crell, grandson of Johannes Crell, another Socinian, who published *Cogitationum novarum de primo et secundo Adamo* at the dawn of the new century.[67] Here, alongside original ideas on the nature of our original ancestors and the significance of their transgression, he defends the need for a reasonable Christianity in which revelation is not at odds with the evidence furnished by reason. Theology derives from just a few general principles such as a coherent system in which the understanding of detail is deduced from the truth of the postulates.[68] Samuel Crell identifies only two principles, both inherent in Adam's nature and the consequences of his sin: the first is that God, having created Adam in a condition of absolute purity, established that the punishment for his transgression would be death; the second is that, if Adam had not sinned, his descendents would have enjoyed the same condition of life without end.[69] The sacrifice of Christ, who, as both the son of God and

65 Crell 1630, *De Deo*, p. 47.

66 On this point I would refer to Biagioni 2007, *L'uomo*, pp. 166–68.

67 Crell 1700, *Cogitationum*. See: Mulsow 2005, *Samuel Crell*; Mulsow 2002, *Moderne*, pp. 68–74, 85–86 and *passim*.

68 Crell 1700, *Cogitationum*, 2r: "Semper ego existimavi, etiam in theologia revelata, dari quaedam principia generalia ex quibus omnia scripturae sacrae phaenomena, nostrae in hoc seculo cognitioni proposita, adeo manifeste deduci possint, ut inde religio Christiana infidelibus reddi possit acceptior, et systema aliquod theologicum, ea ratione deductum, etiam ad uniendos in fide Christianos non parum fortasse contribuat."

69 Crell 1700, *Cogitationum*, 2v–3r: "1. Deum Opt. Max. cum hominem in statu innocentiae creaturus esset, immutabili lege constituisse peccatores morte aeterna illico plectere

the second Adam, restored to man his lost immortality, not only for those who know his word, but also for those "qui ante eius adventum sub primo vivebant Adamo, per Christum ultimo die vivificandos."[70] The *Cogitationum novarum* by Crell was published five years after *The Reasonableness* by Locke and two years before the *Christianae religionis brevis delineatio*. Samuel Crell was a reader and admirer of Locke. In his *Cogitationum novarum* he mentions Locke twice, first when he defends the literal interpretation of "death" in Gen 2:17 proposed in *The Reasonableness*,[71] and secondly when he mentions the first of the *Two Treatises of Government* in his discussion of the significance of condemnation to sweat and toil in Gen 3:19.[72] Locke, in turn, was familiar with the thought of Samuel Crell; in fact, as mentioned above, the *Cogitationum novarum* was among the books in his library.[73]

3.5 The Immortality of Adam, Salvation of Mankind and Toleration: Is there a Relationship?

Locke was aware of the debate concerning the nature of Adam, rendering the theory of a generic or even contradictory approach to the issue implausible. In the edition of *The Reasonableness* edited by John C. Higgins-Biddle,[74] a division of the text into three sections is proposed. The first (chapters I–X) was to be devoted to the quest for the fundamental principles of Christ's teachings, the second (chapters XI–XIV) to the question of salvation, while the third (chapter XV), which serves as an appendix, would explain why the epistles of the Apostles are not considered primary sources, like the Gospel. Chapters I and XI share aspects that make them comparable. Chapter XI takes up the question of the immortality of Adam that the work opens with, almost like a new beginning. However, the meaning is distinctly altered, as we have

---

eosque statim omni vita privare. 2. Constituisse etiam ut parentes nostri primi si in obedientia perfecta absque transgressione legis persisterent, liberos suos in statum vitae absque ulla morte propagarent."

70 Crell 1700, *Cogitationum*, p. 174.

71 Crell 1700, *Cogitationum*, p. 5: "Vide quae ea de re habet auctor egregii libri The reasonableness of Christianity, non longe a principio."

72 Crell 1700, *Cogitationum*. p. 19: "Quod etiam acutissimus et ingeniosissimus Auctor libri Two Treatises of Government Roberto Filmero merito opponit et urget, Tract. I, Cap. V, § 45."

73 See Harrison/Laslett 1965, *The library*, p. 118.

74 Locke 1999, *The Reasonableness*.

seen,[75] and Locke appears to assume the immortal nature of the first man. This paves the way for a passionate defence, especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters, of the universal character of salvation. Locke formulates an extremely broad notion of the kingdom of God, which includes those who lived before Christ as well as those who have never heard of him. In the fourteenth chapter, addressing the question of the salvation of peoples who do not know the Gospel, he confirms "this way of reconciliation, this hope of atonement, the light of Nature revealed to them."[76] The revealed law does not contradict the law of nature, which is hence efficacious in the absence of the other[77] and allows broad swathes of humanity to maintain the hope of salvation even beyond revelation and the teaching of the churches. Savages, who had been excluded along with children by Fausto Sozzini from those able to attain eternal life, are restored to the fullness of their status as sons of God. It is the "light of Nature" that makes possible the natural religion so staunchly opposed by Sozzini in his battle against the principle of the natural immortality of Adam, and it is the natural immortality of Adam an unequivocal sign of his likeness to the Father, that—more and beyond revelation—assures all men of their destination to salvation. The image of human reason as a "Candle of the Lord", to which Locke resorts in *The Reasonableness*,[78] is influenced by the teachings of the Arminians and the Cambridge Platonists (it is an expression used, for example, by Benjamin Whichcote and Nathaniel Culverwell).[79] Similar expressions (above all "lumen naturae") are also frequently found in the *Essays on the Law of Nature*,[80] which dates to the first half of the sixties, and was influenced by the Cambridge Platonists. It addresses the question of the natural knowledge of God in line with parameters that evoke the thought of Johannes Crell. It is only in *The Reasonableness*, however, that an explicit and direct link between natural law and redemption is established. The law of nature, that is not inscribed within the human mind but can be understood through the light of reason, reveals to man that there exists but one God, good and merciful, and shows him "the way of Atoning the merciful,

75 See *supra*, notes 15 and 16, p. 60.

76 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 190.

77 This argument was discussed between Locke and William Popple in May 1595 with regard to *A Discourse concerning natural and revealed Religion* by Stephen Nye (see: Simonutti 2005, *John Locke*, pp. 226–227).

78 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 190.

79 This observation is made by Mario Sina in Locke 1979, *Scritti*, p. 411.

80 Here I would mention, as an example, the title of the second chapter: "An lex naturae sit lumine naturae cognoscibilis?"; Locke 2002, *Essays*, p. 122.

kind, compassionate Author and Father of him and his Being, when he had transgressed that Law,"[81] leading him to salvation.

Subsequent to *The Reasonableness*, the idea of the immortal nature of Adam appears to have prevailed. It is expressly confirmed in *Christianae Religionis brevis delineatio*[82] while it is also assumed in *A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*. We have an indication of this, for example, when, having reached the comment on Rom 5:12 ("Per unum hominem peccatum in hunc mundum intravit, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines mors pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt"), Locke specifies that he has translated "have sinned" to "became mortal."[83] This choice is generated primarily by the intention of denying the transmissibility of sin, but it is unlikely that Locke did not realize the ulterior consequences deriving from it. This passage from the New Testament had been the crux of the disputation between Pucci and Sozzini: the former had used it as proof that the mortal condition arrived only after transgression,[84] while the latter had attributed to the expression that the meaning of eternal death, "non autem mortalis conditio, sive ipsa mors naturalis"[85] was already inscribed in the nature of Adam; therefore, it did not denote a change in his initial condition, as "become mortal" would appear to suggest, but was the antecedent of every sin, the first example of how man could lose himself for eternity. Shortly afterwards, commenting on the sixth chapter, Locke refers to Christ as he through whom grace "reestablished in immortality"[86] for the men who had lost their lives owing to Adam's sin. Here too it is hard to believe that Locke was unaware of the words used by Sozzini to reject the theory of the restoration of man to an original state of immortality since "mortalis [...] erat non modo post lapsum sed etiam ante lapsum."[87] It was, in fact, Christ who had first opened the gates of eternal life. In conclusion, it does not seem plausible that in *A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, referring to the immortality promised by Christ, Locke made an unconscious use of expressions such as "to restore," "to re-establish," "to return," and "restoration" which imply the pre-existence of the condition of immortality prior to Adam's fall. This is also demonstrated by the fact that in *The Reasonableness*, to express the same concept, namely that God in his

81 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 190.
82 See *supra*, p. 57.
83 Locke 1987, *A Paraphrase*, 2, p. 523.
84 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 10.
85 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 22.
86 Locke 1987, *A Paraphrase*, 2, p. 530.
87 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, p. 26.

infinite mercy had wished to offer man the possibility of eternal life through Jesus Christ, Locke had resorted to the expression "to bestow,"[88] which indicates a gift or a concession rather than restitution. Consequently, it appears a more reasonable conjecture to judge these linguistic choices in Locke's last writings as traces of an evolution in his thought, which led him to ponder the importance of the question of the immortal nature of Adam. This could have formed the basis of an extremely latitudinarian vision of the kingdom of God, and hence of salvation, since it rendered natural a condition otherwise set beyond the order of the world and restricted to the few capable of receiving the word of the Gospel. Derived from this is its relevance to the idea of natural religion and the salvation of savages. It does not appear incidental that this principle made headway in Locke's thought since, especially in *The Reasonableness*, he turns his attention towards the Holy Scriptures, seeking a point of balance between political and theological thought, and between toleration and belonging to the kingdom of God. If there existed a natural law capable of leading man towards the recognition of justice, then it was reasonable to assume the existence of a natural religion capable of leading man beyond confessional divisions and towards good and salvation.

88 Locke 2002, *Writings*, p. 169.

CHAPTER 4

Infinite Mercy and the Infinite Universe: Francesco Pucci and Giordano Bruno

4.1 The Infinite Amplitude of the Kingdom of God

"And new philosophy calls all in doubt, /The element of fire is quite put out; /The sun is lost, and th'earth, and no man's wit/Can well direct him, where to look for it."[1] So the poet John Donne expressed his dismay at the crisis of certainties caused by the new science and philosophy that called into question the traditional conception of the world. It was 1611 and the image of a world finite and hierarchically organized was being undermined by the idea of an infinite universe without end and without center, held together only by the unity of its physical laws. The year before, in *Sidereus Nuncius*, Galilei had announced the extraordinary discoveries he had made with his telescope, and in 1584 Giordano Bruno, in the Italian dialogue *De l'infinito, universo e mondi*, had put forward the theory, based on metaphysical reasons, that the universe was infinite and infinitely populated. The change from "the closed world to the infinite universe," as Alexandre Koyré entitled his most famous work,[2] was a revolution that modified the foundations of western thought in the Early Modern Age. Destruction of the cosmos and geometrization of space were not only scientific problems, but also philosophical and theological issues: "Science, philosophy, even theology, are, all of them, legitimately interested in questions about the nature of space, structure of matter, patterns of action and, last but not least, about the nature, structure, and value of human thinking and of human science."[3] In his letter to Benedetto Castelli in 1613, and in one to Christina of Lorraine in 1615, Galilei defended the Copernican system and the "libertas philosophandi" with arguments of biblical exegesis that had been used in the religious debates of the previous century and later in the biblical criticism of Richard Simon.[4] If the seventeenth century had been the age of scientific revolution and philosophical rationalism, the sixteenth century was that of theology: ethical, political and scientific topics were discussed

1 John Donne, *An Anatomy of the World*, vs. 205–208, in Donne 1990, *The Major*, p. 212.

2 Koyré 1957, *From the closed World*.

3 Koyré 1957, *From the closed World*, p. IX.

4 On the letter to Cristina of Lorena, see: Diamanti 2010, *Libertas*.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004335783_005

through theological language, and the main cultural issues of the time were related to contemporary religious controversies. The medieval and humanistic idea of a closed world and a closed knowledge created by God for the sake of mankind was being undermined by geographic and astronomical discoveries. The heavens and the earth had broadened far beyond the limits assigned by western civilization, and their new breadth caused ethical, civil and political consequences. The problem of the amplitude of the kingdom of God, equivalent to the amplitude of civil society, summarized all these topics in theological debate. The difficulties of the Aristotelean-Ptolemaic system in representing a world with uncertain boundaries were reflected, on the side of theological thought, in the difficulty of determining the right way to eternal salvation, what categories of men were part of God's plan, and the role of the Holy Scriptures, which seemed to be increasingly circumscribed to a limited geographical area of a world with continuously expanding boundaries. The problem of the amplitude of the kingdom of God was one of the topics most fraught with historical and cultural consequences in the theological controversies of the sixteenth century, primarily because it was closely connected to the problem of toleration.[5] In fact, while Europe was being bathed in blood by religious wars and many countries were trying to extend their domains into the New World by force, the discussion on toleration and the natural rights of men, regardless of their religious beliefs, was becoming particularly important. The ravages committed by the *Conquistadores* against whole civilizations would have had no justification if those peoples had not been considered as alien to human society as animals: what kind of people were those to whom the word of God was unknown and who had never heard of Jesus Christ? This is why, as Montaigne wrote in his *Essays*, the colonization of those lands was transformed into "a butchery, as though they were wild beasts": the extermination was not of sons of God destined to eternal life.[6]

The position of Arthur Lovejoy, who argued that Giordano Bruno had been the first to support the theory of the infinite universe, is now commonly accepted.[7] Although some of the assumptions of that theory were already present in the works of Nicholas of Cusa, Bruno was the one who placed this idea at the center of a cosmological and metaphysical vision with the

5 On this topic, see for example: Gliozzi 1977, *Adamo*; Biasiori 2010, *L'eretico*.

6 See: Montaigne 1962, *Oeuvres*, pp. 891–892. On the topic of the New World in Montaigne, see: Lestringant 1990, *Le Huguenot*; Lestringant 1996, *L'experience*; Lestringant 2005, *Le Brésil*.

7 Lovejoy 1964, *The great chain*.

awareness and zeal of a new prophet, as witnessed in the *Italian Dialogues*.[8] Bruno's conviction of the infinity of the universe was not based on astronomical observations, nor derived from his defence of Copernicanism. Moreover, to his way of thinking, science was still connected with the naturalism of the Renaissance, the materialism of Pomponazzi, and the pantheistic vitalism of Neoplatonism. The infinity of the universe has a metaphysical cause related to the so-called "principle of plenitude," which Bruno interpreted literally by saying that an infinite God must necessarily create an infinite space.[9] Bruno had already clearly enunciated this notion in *La cena de le ceneri* when, in the third dialogue, Teofilo declared that the world "essendo effetto e principiato da una causa infinita e principio infinito, deve secondo la capacità sua corporale e modo suo essere infinitamente infinito."[10] Such an idea seemed so innovative and outside traditional cosmology that it became one of the charges brought against Bruno during the process in Rome. Koyré says that the influence of these ideas probably only took effect later in the seventeenth century, when the discoveries of Galilei provided scientific arguments that made it more plausible.[11] In the age of Bruno, it is conceivable that the ideas appeared to be too audacious and that they made only a general contribution to the anti-Aristotelian controversy; overall, their diffusion was limited.

After being forced to end the series of lessons he had been receiving in Oxford in favor of the Copernican theory, Bruno returned to London, most likely in the summer of 1583, where he took part in debates at the Elizabethan court. Here he came close to the puritan faction led by Robert Dudley. These intellectual circles showed interest in scientific questions (especially the Copernican theory) as well as in geographical ones (the consequences of the discovery of the New World), often in opposition to the narrow-mindedness of university circles (hence the preference for the use of the vernacular rather than Latin). Bruno had the chance to attack academic pedantry, sustaining his cosmological theories; however, his philosophy of the infinite universe went further than the astronomical perspectives of Copernicanism. In his opinion, the denial of the centrality of the earth did not mean the loss of a privileged position for mankind; on the contrary, building on the ideas of Cusanus and Lucretius, Bruno extolled it as the demolition of the walls of a gloomy prison,

8 The *Italian Dialogues* were written in England while Bruno was living with the French ambassador Michel de Castelnau, and published in 1584 by the printer John Charlewood.

9 "It had been far more splendid, glorious and magnificent for God to have made the universe commensurated with his own immensity" (Lovejoy 1964, *The great chain*, p. 126).

10 Bruno 2007, *Opere*, 1, p. 508.

11 Koyré 1957, *From the closed World*, pp. 54–55.

leading man to the discovery of a new, free, endless, and changeable world.[12] Such an enlarged vision of the universe had many consequences, including fields of knowledge far beyond cosmology, such as those concerning the question of the origins of inhabitants of lands recently discovered. In *De immenso*, Bruno supported the polygenetic theory, according to which men and animals are born by spontaneous generation thanks to the strength of nature operating uninterruptedly in the infinite universe.[13] Reproduction resulting from the union of two creatures of different sex is only one process through which matter reproduces itself. The existence of peoples until then unknown, living in lands recently discovered, was not a problem for Bruno; rather, it supported his ideas.[14] Intellectual circles in London, especially Philip Sidney's, showed great interest in this position, partly because of its political implications on colonial competition with Spain and, therefore on the debate on the juridical and philosophical justification of European dominion.[15] Few, however, were really inclined to abandon the monogenetic doctrine.[16] Once again the position of Bruno transcended the limits of debate. Even though he dedicated the *Spaccio della bestia trionfante* to Philip Sidney, the *Italian Dialogues* expressed not only a criticism of the Spanish policy of conquest, but also of the colonial intentions of England, as both revealed the same logic of violence that had caused the religious wars in Europe. In Bruno's opinion, the Spanish, by using force instead of words, had exposed those peoples to the "arte de tirannizar e sassinar l'un l'altro," as he wrote in *La cena de le ceneri*.[17] The philosophy of the infinite universe called into question not only the central position of mankind

12 Koyré 1957, *From the closed World*, p. 42.

13 In *De immenso et innumerabilibus* Bruno wrote: "Ut quando aestivo excidunt ex aëre guttae, candentem in campum, qualem terit Appulus et Lybs, pulvere ab excocto consurgit rana repente guttarum exaequans numerum, quo credere possis, quando solum spectes, caeli e regione cadentes; sic vis immenso in spacio est, inque aethere, totum quod capit, ut magnum mundi per inane genantur, undique nam vita est, animae actusque undique surgit, factor ad archetypum obiectum, et formabile praesto est; hinc surgit serpens, piscis, mus, rana coaxans, hinc cervus, vulpes, ursus, leo, mulus, homoque est" (Bruno/Campanella 1956, *Opere*, p. 746).

14 Because of his ideas, Bruno was considered one of the first upholders of pre-adamitical theories, as written in 1661 by Johannes Ursinus in his confutation of *Preadamites* by Isaac La Péyrere (Ursinus 1661, *De Zoroastre*, pp. 4–5). Ursinus' position was later adopted by Bayle 1740, *Dictionnaire*, I, p. 680.

15 On this topic, see for example: Pirillo 2010, *Filosofia*, pp. 143–170.

16 See: Pirillo 2010, *Filosofia ed eresia*, pp. 164–170.

17 Bruno 2007, *Opere*, p. 452.

within the universe, but also that of European civilization in relation to others, thus destroying one of the ideological foundations of colonial policy.

In the theological thought of the sixteenth century, the question of the borders of the "closed" world is related to the problem of fixing the ideal boundaries of the kingdom of God. To belong to the kingdom of God meant to fully enjoy human dignity and all the rights that came from it. Only Christians, i.e., baptized men, were considered to be full members of mankind; therefore "Christian" became synonymous with "man." However, the breaking up of Christian Europe owing to the Reformation and the discovery of peoples that had never known the word of God, and who therefore were foreign to divine revelation, had made the borders of the kingdom of God very uncertain. Mutual accusations of heresy, the doubt of belonging or not to the true Christian church, the uncertainty of being among the reprobates or among the redeemed, are all questions that made the conformation of the kingdom of God extremely complex. In this context the debate on the extension of the kingdom of God interlaced itself with that on toleration. It is not by chance that some of the most important contributions to this debate emerged from the controversy aroused by the condemnation to the stake of Michael Servetus, executed in Geneva in October 1553. Calvin justified his own behavior in *Defensio orthodoxae fidei*, saying that it was necessary to punish and put to death heretics who had called basic dogmas into question. The best-known reply to Calvin's *Defensio* was *De haereticis an sint persequendi*, edited by Sebastian Castellio in Basel in Spring 1554. It consisted of a collection of texts, some by Castellio (also under pseudonyms), others by authors that defended the principle of religious toleration. These texts supported the idea that religious freedom was strictly necessary because divine reason, that is *logos*, could fully reveal itself in history through a continuous and open confrontation of various opinions.[18]

Among those who had worked together with Castellio in writing the book was the Italian exile Celio Secondo Curione, who later intervened in the dispute on toleration with a book entitled *De amplitudine beati regni Dei* (1554).[19] Here he opposed the Calvinist vision of a restricted Church of God's elects in accordance with the doctrine of double predestination, with his vision of an extremely wide Church, based on the idea that infinite divine mercy must of necessity correspond to an extraordinarily large number of saved people; therefore, he refused the principle of *massa damnationis*, according to which most of mankind is destined to eternal damnation. Curione offered a more open

18 See, for example: Visentin 1997, *Introduzione*, pp. LVIII–LXII.

19 This work was published, in a semi-clandestine edition, at Poschiavo in Switzerland after opposition by censors in Basel. An early version dated back to the years before the exile, probably the second half of the Forties, when Curione was still in Italy.

vision of a universal church, one that included peoples recently discovered as well as men who had lived before Christ. Curione defended this idea with many arguments: the extension of the kingdom of God must be equal to its endless power, the large number of its subjects is a sign of the King's magnificence, the salvation of sons is a cause of joy for the father, and the domination of Satan cannot prevail over that of the Lord. The principle of God's infinite mercy and the consequent amplitude of the kingdom had originated from Erasmus, especially from *De immensa Dei misericordia*, a work that Curione had certainly read and discussed in Italy thanks to an edition in vernacular by the Carmelite Marsilio Andreasi.[20] Erasmus postulated the universal salvation of mankind, a principle that came from Origen's thought. The faith in the boundless love of God would have allowed all mankind to enter the universal, spiritual and evangelical church. The idea of a wide road to salvation, an alternative not only to Calvin's doctrine of double predestination, but also to catholic sacramentalism, was one of the main topics of European Erasmianism: it reached its maximum diffusion in Spain thanks to the phenomenon of Alumbradism,[21] and in Italy through the so-called "theology of the open sky,"[22] according to which individual salvation corresponded to simple inner conviction of the salvation of the soul.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, an aversion to Calvinist predestination arose in several European countries, often in accordance with the development of latitudinarian doctrines about the problem of salvation. Many critical voices could be heard in reformed Switzerland: first, Calvin expelled Jérôme Bolsec from Geneva, then he had to confront Johann Haller's doubts in Bern and the violent attacks of the minister Andrée Zébédée in the countries of Vaud.[23] In 1552 he published *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* in which he refuted the extreme latitudinarianism of the Benedectine monk Giorgio Siculo and of the Dutch theologian Albert Pigghe.[24] Finally, in the 1559 edition of *Institutio religionis Christianae*, he definitively formulated the dogma of double predestination by placing it close to the concept of divine Providence as one of the fundamental principles of God's eternal plan.[25] The debate became even

20 This book was published for the first time in Brescia in 1542 (Andreasi 1542, *Trattato*). At Curione's request, this treatise was translated into Latin and published in Basel in 1550 (Andreasi 1550, *De amplitudine*). On Andreasi, see: Alberigo 1961, *Andreasi*.

21 For bibliographical references on Alumbradism, see: Firpo 1990, *Tra alumbrados*; Pastore 2004, *Un'eresia*.

22 See: Seidel Menchi 1987, *Erasmo*, pp. 143–167.

23 See: Vuilleumier 1929, *Histoire de l'église*, t. I.

24 Calvin 1870, *De aeterna*. On Giorgio Siculo, see especially: Prosperi 2000, *L'eresia*.

25 See: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, pp. 307–315.

more heated with his successor Théodore de Bèze, especially after the 1586 Colloquy of Montbéliard, which had been organized to reach an agreement between the Reformed and Lutherans concerning the Lord's Supper. It caused a clash of opinions on predestination.[26] The strongest repercussions occurred initially in Bern, where the minister Samuel Huber led a protest against the head of the Church, Wolfgang Musculus, because he had subscribed to Bèze's positions. Huber declared that Christ had suffered and died on the Cross to save all men, not only the predestined, through the infinite amplitude of his benefit. After being expelled from Bern, Huber went to Tübingen where he was received under the protection of the Lutheran theologian Jakob Andreae, an opponent of Bèze in Montbéliard. Here he continued his attacks against the Church of Geneva, and also against every type of predestinationism, which, in his opinion, was concealing too much inside the Lutheran Church. His latitudinarianism was soon regarded as an extreme position, which triggered the reaction of one of the most important Lutheran theologians of the time, Aegidius Hunnius of the University of Wittenberg. Hunnius started a long controversy against Huber that continued until the early seventeenth century.[27]

The most radical doctrine in opposition to the dogma of double predestination was advanced, however, by the Italian exile Francesco Pucci during the last decades of the sixteenth century.[28] Pucci pushed Erasmus's attempt to select a few *fundamentalia fidei* necessary for salvation to the extreme. He reduced the fundamentals to one: the natural belief in a God, creator of the universe and infinitely merciful towards all his sons. It was the only article of faith on which the universal Church should have been founded to enable it to receive all men with open arms without frontiers in time or space, including those ignorant of the divine revelation, either because they had lived before the time of Christ or because they had been born in lands recently discovered.[29] The infinite mercy of God coincided with the endless amplitude of his kingdom. Pucci came to know Calvin's *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione* rather late. He speaks about it for the first time in *De praedestinatione*, written

26 Raitt 1993, *The Colloquy*; Adam 1970, *Der Streit*, pp. 29–49.

27 Adam 1970, *Der Streit*; Biagioni 1999, *Incontri*; Biagioni 2000, *Introduzione*.

28 For an updated bibliography about Pucci, see: Caravale 2011, *Il profeta* (now also in English: Caravale 2015, *The Italian*); Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*.

29 In his *Thesis* of 1578 Pucci writes: "Totum genus humanum esse efficienter particeps beneficii Christi servatoris et redemptoris in ipso matris utero et innocentiae aetate (nempe ante rationis et iudicii); singulis vero eis, qui rationis et iudicii usum habent, dari cognitionem Dei creatoris coeli et terrae ad salutem, quo ei fidant et ab eo pendeant, et cum sanctis verisque Christianis consentiant. Proinde non imminere iram Dei ad Aeternum exitium nisi contemptoribus divinae lucis" (Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, I, p. 22).

in Prague in 1589.[30] He fights all forms of predestinationism, understood as the worst possible mistake resulting from malice that had ever obfuscated human reason after the original sin. He cites Bèze's *Ad Acta Colloquii Montisbelgardensis Tubingae edita Responsionis pars altera*,[31] yet considered Bèze and Calvin simply as the most recent and firm supporters of that prejudice, which had been introduced by St. Augustine. Subsequently, and also because of the authority that Augustine had acquired, the idea of a small number of predestinated grew stronger and began to spread, darkening the fundamental truth on which the universal Church had been founded: the principle of the salvation of the whole of mankind in virtue of the efficacy of Christ's benefit alone. Pucci underlined the connection between this topic and the final destiny of peoples recently discovered. In fact, he wrote that Augustine was evidently in error when he denied the existence of Antipodes, as demonstrated by the existence of peoples in the newly discovered lands. If he had not restricted the habitable world to such a small piece of land isolated from others because of the torrid zone, "aliquanto melius sensisset et scripsisset de tot populis, quibus ignota fuit et adhuc est historia originum et Christi incarnati evangelium."[32] Pucci goes on to state that the discoveries showed that the geographical presence of mankind was much more extensive than previously thought and that only a very small portion knew the word of God. It would be absurd to believe that the promises of the Bible had been addressed only to one section of mankind, abandoning all others to a destiny of death. The New World, still largely unexplored, represented the infinite wideness of divine mercy which fills the confines of God's kingdom, illuminating everyone with his wisdom and reason sufficient to lead all men towards good and eternal salvation.

4.2 Erasmian Affinities: Francesco Pucci and Giordano Bruno

The hypothesis of an encounter between Pucci and Bruno was formulated for the first time by Luigi Firpo in his essay *Processo e morte di Francesco Pucci* published in 1949.[33] This conjecture was primarily based on the similarity of the routes that the two Italian exiles had followed through Europe during the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Their tragic ends in the prison of the Holy Office in Rome, where they cohabited before being put to death, were equally

30 Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*.

31 Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*, pp. 33, 289–290.

32 Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*, p. 187.

33 Firpo 1949, *Processo e morte* (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 17–51).

similar. As already mentioned, Pucci returned to England from Basel after the dispute on the immortality of Adam with Fausto Sozzini between 1577 and 1578, and remained there until 1582. He then headed for Krakow via Flanders and some German towns. He arrived in the autumn of 1583 with the intention of re-starting the interrupted controversy with Sozzini, who had settled there. During that time Bruno arrived in Paris from Geneva, and remained until 1583. In mid June, he decided to cross the English Channel to establish himself in England. Although Pucci had just left the country, the groups and individuals that Bruno frequented in London and in Oxford were mostly the same as Pucci's. When Bruno returned to France in October 1585, he began a series of attacks against Aristotelism, which aroused bitter disputes and created hostility. As a result, he sought better luck in Germany and, between 1586 and 1588, was successively in Mainz, Wiesbaden, Marburg, and Wittenberg. In the spring of 1588 he went to Prague, perhaps in the hope of receiving the favor of Emperor Rudolph II; his expectations were probably not met, and he remained in the city for only six months. Pucci was in Prague at that time: he had arrived nearly three years prior and was in the midst of what was to be his longest stay in any city during his twenty-year exile. He left the city in 1591 with the intention of returning directly to Italy; however, his journey, which ended up spanning two years, led him through Germany, France, and the Netherlands, where he published his most important work, *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* (Gouda, 1592). It was only when Cardinal Ippolito Aldobrandini ascended to the papal throne with the name of Clemente VIII and Henry of Navarre opened new perspectives in European religious policy that Pucci finally decided to go to Rome at the end of 1592. Similar reasons induced Bruno to return to Italy that same year. He was captured in Venice and began the processual journey that, in the following year, resulted in his incarceration in the Holy Office in Rome where Francesco Pucci was also imprisoned. They shared the same space from 1594 until the beheading of the Florentine in Tor di Nona on the 5th of July 1597. Pucci's body was burned in Campo dei Fiori, the same place where Giordano Bruno was to be burned at the stake on the 17th of February 1600.

Despite the interweaving of their journeys, the two Italian exiles had the chance to meet only twice: once in the winter of 1588 in Prague, and during the three years of incarceration at the Holy Office in Rome. Luigi Firpo concentrated his attention on the latter period and, studying the lists of prisoners who were present during the periodic visits of the cardinals, he ascertained that, between December 20, 1594 and March 24, 1597, they had certainly had opportunities to hold discussions together.[34] The conjecture was made more credible by the testimonies of Tommaso Campanella published in the edition

34 Firpo 1998, *Il processo*, pp. 222, 230, 233, 236, 242.

of *Quod reminiscentur* restored by Romano Amerio in 1939. Campanella was also incarcerated with Pucci, and in *Quod reminiscentur* he expressed his admiration for his fellow prisoner, who knew by heart the works of Luther and Calvin and with whom he had often talked during the three months of common captivity.[35] As regards an encounter between Pucci and Bruno, no documentary evidence has been found to date that confirms or denies it; however, some clues lead us to accept the possibility that Bruno came into contact with Pucci's thought even before their years spent together in prison, very probably in Prague. For example, in the first part of the *Trial record*, where one can find the depositions of the Venetian nobleman Giovanni Mocenigo regarding the early months of the stay of the philosopher at his home, it is written that Bruno: "mentre ragionò della resurrettione asseriva che tutti sarieno salvati."[36] Many San Domenico di Castello prisoners attributed the Erasmian idea of the universal salvation of mankind, stemming from Origen, to Bruno during the Venetian phase of his trial. Among those testimonies is that of the Capuchin friar Celestino da Verona, who had been in the same extremely delicate position of *relapsus* as Bruno since September 1592, and was eventually burnt at the stake in 1599. Friar Celestino claimed to have heard Bruno say: "Non ci è Inferno e nissuno è dannato di pena eterna, ma che con tempo ogn'uno si salva, allegando il profeta: 'Nunquid in Aeternum Deus irascetur,'"[37] followed by: "tutti sariano salvati, sino ai demoni."[38] The deposition of Friar Celestino da Verona was confirmed by many other witnesses: the Carmelite Giulio da Salò, the carpenter Francesco Vaia, Matteo De Silvestris, and Francesco Graziano of Udine, an educated person able to speak Latin had heard Bruno mention another verse of Psalms: "Homines et iumenta salvabis Domine."[39] The Origenian and Erasmian source of the vision of the universal salvation of mankind, however, does not help us understand why it appears with some frequency in the thought of Bruno, especially from that time forward. It is more plausible to assume that in his intellectual life of encounters, readings and discussions, such a notion came from a closer source.

As we know, the notion of the universal salvation of mankind was the core of the preaching of Francesco Pucci. He defended this belief, without substantial theoretical development, before every intellectual, clergyman or reformer

35 "Ego loquutus sum cum Francisco Puccio Filidino haeretico, qui 28 annis servivit Luthero et Calvino, eorumque libros memoria tenebat [et per tres menses cum eo in S. Officio conversatus sum]" (Campanella 1939, *Quod reminiscentur*, I, p. 144).

36 Firpo, *Il processo*, p. 249.

37 *Ps.*, CII, 9.

38 Firpo 1998, *Il processo*, p. 266.

39 *Ps.*, XXXV, 7.

he met during his travels through Europe. His trust in the infinite reach of Christ's benefit, which takes effect for every man from birth, had already been expressed in his early theological writings composed in England, particularly in the letter to Niccolò Balbani in 1576.[40] This trust became the subject of his *Thesis* to all lovers of truth, a printed sheet distributed in Basel in 1578,[41] and was also the main topic of his first book, *Informatione della religione christiana*, printed in London at the end of 1579.[42] Pucci fully expounded his theological thought during the years spent in Prague in a series of works that he left as manuscript, such as *De Praedestinatione*,[43] *De regno Christi*, and *Del regno di Christo*, a long poem in *ottava rima* (twenty cantos for a total of 1,638 strophas).[44] In these works the principle of the universal salvation of mankind is first opposed to the dogma of predestination in all its historical forms, from Augustine to Bèze; it is then discussed in relation to the coming of a new era, the so-called millennium, an age of love and toleration, with the long-awaited great renovation of Christianity.

Bruno spent six months in Prague beginning in the spring of 1588, the same period during which Pucci's works were taking form; we know, in fact, that he started writing them in 1589. Even if we do not have historical evidence of an encounter between the two, echoes of topics and language that recall Pucci can be found in the works of Bruno after his passage through Prague. In the *Trial record*, for example, in addition to the topic of the universal salvation of mankind, one can find references to a great reformation of Christianity ("presto il mondo haverebbe visto una riforma generale di se stesso, perché era impossibile che durassero tante corruttele, e che sperava gran cose sul re di Navarra") and even, though in an ironic tone, to the forthcoming end of time (Bruno told Mocenigo, "ch'io aspettassi il giudicio quando tutti ressuscitaranno, che vedrò all'hora il premio del mio merito").[45] The references to the necessity of toleration and of the recovery of apostolic simplicity make us ponder the possibility of an encounter between them in Prague. Mocenigo's testimony states that Bruno had complained because "chi hora non vuol essere catholico bisogna che provi il castigo e la pena, perché si usa la forza e non

40 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, I, pp. 23–54.

41 See: *supra*, note nr. 27.

42 Pucci 1580, *Informatione*. But now see: Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*.

43 Now see: Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*.

44 *De regno Christi* and the poem *Del regno di Christo* are still in manuscript.

45 Firpo 1998, *Il processo*, p. 248.

l'amore, e che questo mondo non potea durare così."[46] Bruno uses very similar words in his letter *Ad divum Rodolphum II*, which opens the *Articuli centum et sexaginta adversus huius tempestatis mathematicos atque philosophos*, written in Prague in 1588. He writes that today natural laws are overwhelmed by fury: man attacks man rather than other animals "et lex illa amoris longe lateque diffusa nusquam servata iaceat."[47]

Michele Ciliberto defined the work as "one of the most effective writings, even the most successful, that Nolan has ever written,"[48] highlighting its message of peace and toleration. This glorification of evangelical values did not occur frequently in Bruno's earlier works; there is neither the sarcasm nor the aggression of his other writings. Bruno emphasizes the negative nature of the theological controversies, which put the foundations of civil life at risk, and hopes for the coming of a religion that can bring men together, not set them against each other. In *Spaccio della bestia trionfante* he had favored a model of the ancient wisdom of the Egyptians and Romans, but now he turned his attention to the principles of the infinite mercy of God and love towards one's neighbor, typical of the Erasmian tradition, which in those times were being proclaimed in Prague by Francesco Pucci. Bruno and Pucci often frequented the same circles in the imperial city. The Florentine exile was connected to the astronomer Tadeas Hajeck, who was well known at Court. Hajek provided Andrea Dudith in Wrocław with information about Pucci[49] and was also acquainted with Matthaeus Wacker, Bruno's admirer, and Ticho Brahe, who did not have any esteem for Bruno.[50] Francesco Lenzoni, ambassador of Tuscany to the Emperor, wrote in a November 1588 dispatch that Pucci continued his disputes with the Jesuits and frequented heretics, even after having formally abjured and returned to the Catholic Church.[51] In his letter *Ad divum Rodolphum II* Bruno uses expressions that are very close to Pucci's language: for example, he refers to the "lumen rationis nobis a Deo immissum" that induces everyone to raise their eyes and turn them "ad amoenissimum lucis fulgorem" in order to follow it "simplici spiritu ingenuoque cordis affect."[52]

---

46 Firpo 1998, *Il processo*, p. 248. Similar words in: Pucci 1592, *De Christi*, p. 84: "et pro divina consolatione, in gustu caelestis rationis, quam dat apostolica doctrina, inducit caecam imitationem caecorum praesulum et horrorem ac metum atri tetrique tribunalis."

47 Bruno 1889, *Articuli*, p. 4, rr. 13–14.

48 Ciliberto 2007, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 395.

49 Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le périple*, pp. 194, 209; Pucci, *De praedestinatione*, p. 5.

50 Brahe ironically called Bruno "nullanus" (Ciliberto 2007, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 394).

51 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, p. 206.

52 Bruno 1889, *Articuli*, pp. 6–7.

Pucci often uses the image of the light of reason, or simply of light shining all over the universe, to illustrate his idea of the natural revelation of God through Creation, which provides all men with efficacious knowledge to reach final salvation. In *Informatione della religione christiana*, for example, he writes that God reveals himself to men "mediante la sua sapienza et ragione, la quale penetra e risplende per tutto l'universo e in noi stessi con divinissimi raggi."[53] The reason why most people lose their way and "si avvolge pel mondo et va di male in peggio" is that "trascura di indirizzare la vita secondo questo interno lume, et d'havere per suo principal fine il piacere a Dio et il vivere secondo le buone inspirationi."[54] This small book soon became very rare because the censorial intervention was very quick and effective; only a few copies escaped confiscation and destruction.[55] Even so, Bruno may have known of this work or its contents. We know that Bruno was connected with the Florentine exile Jacopo Corbinelli, a man of letters unwelcomed by the Medici family because of his political views. Bruno is mentioned in some of Corbinelli's 1586 letters sent from Paris to the bibliophile Gian Vincenzo Pinelli in Padua,[56] where he is described, in a very friendly tone, as a "piacevol compagnietto, epicuro per la vita."[57] Corbinelli later expresses appreciation in regard to Bruno's attacks against the Aristotelian philosophy at the Collège de Cambrai, writing that "per quel poco ch'io intendo mi par che e' dica molto bene le ragion sue." Perhaps Corbinelli and his circle are those "signori ch'io conoscevo" who, during the trial, Bruno had frequented in Paris. Among them was Piero Del Bene, abbot of Belleville, to whom *Figuratio Aristotelici Physici auditus*, published by Bruno in the early months of 1586, was dedicated. One can speculate about what common cultural, political and religious interests linked the exiles of this circle.[58] It is not difficult to identify ideas and inclinations that might have been the common ground of their discussions; for example, it is not difficult to imagine polemic positions against the policies of Sisto V in support of King Henry III and then King Henry IV of Navarre.[59] The latter aroused great expectations for a conclusive reformation of Christianity not only in Bruno, but also in Francesco

53 Pucci 1580, *Informatione*, p. 12; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, p. 91.

54 Pucci 1580, *Informatione*, p. 63; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, p. 102.

55 See *supra*, 2.4.

56 See: Yates 2006, *Giordano Bruno*.

57 Yates 2006, Giordano Bruno, pp. 124.

58 See, for example: Scapparone 2009, *Une religion*.

59 "On the one hand, *Spaccio della bestia trionfante* (1584) is a political pamphlet containing a passionate defence of the King of France, Henry III, against intrigues of the Spain or of the League" (Yates, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 131).

Pucci. Although Bruno's relationship with Corbinelli has been confirmed only for the years 1585–1586, one can speculate that it dated back to Bruno's first stay in Paris,[60] and that it influenced his activities in England, where Corbinelli had lived in 1569. We know that Pucci also belonged to Corbinelli's circle and that their relationship was probably rather close. In May 1575, when the Florentine was debating in London with the Consistory of the French Church, Corbinelli wrote to Pinelli, expressing his regret for the vicissitudes "del povero Pucci che è nostro allievo."[61] We cannot know what he meant when he defined Pucci as one of his pupils, but his words were not ironic, and Pinelli probably well understood their meaning. Pucci had collaborated with Corbinelli to print the *Apologia del tirannicidio* of Lorenzino de'Medici in Basel in 1577, which ultimately failed.[62] In addition, he had sent the first copies of *Informatione della religione christiana* to Corbinelli from England. We know that Corbinelli was collaborating with Pucci to distribute the *Informatione* when, at the end of summer 1581, Bruno left Toulouse for Paris, where he most likely got in touch with Corbinelli. Even if Bruno had not had the chance of holding a copy of this small book in his hands, he had at least had the opportunity to be informed of its contents.

Some similarities between Bruno's thought and Pucci's were also noticed by their contemporaries; for example, the Jesuit Nicolas Serarius published *Contra novos novi pelagiani et chiliastae Francisci Puccii Filidini errores*, in Würzburg in 1593 in order to refute Pucci's *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*.[63] In the tenth chapter, devoted to the topic of baptism,[64] Serarius considers the assertion where Pucci compares the vow of baptism to the natural instinct of every creature to look for what is helpful and healthy, and to avoid what is harmful.[65] Serarius concludes that, if that were true, not only human beings, but also all animals, would be destined for heaven,[66] which, in his opinion, would be absurd. In this case, the aim of Serarius, most likely, was to ridicule

60 Scapparone 2009, *Une religion*, p. 60.

61 Carta 2012, *Il nostro allievo*.

62 Caravale 2007, *Da Firenze a Parigi*; Caravale 2011, *Il profeta disarmato*, pp. 82–88; Carta 2008, *Francesco Guicciardini*, pp. 170–187.

63 Serarius 1593, *Contra novos*, p. 26. On this issue, see: Gorfunkel 1997, *Notizie Bruniane*. See also: Ciliberto 2007, *Giordano Bruno*, pp. 355–357.

64 "De iis quae contra Baptismi necessitatem undique corrasit Filidinus" (Serarius 1593, *Contra novos*, p. 31).

65 "Creatoris beneficio, singuli mortales salutaria appetunt et noxia respuunt. Et in hoc generali voto continetur virtualiter votum baptismi" (Pucci 1592, *De Christi*, p. 75).

66 "Tuo igitur Chrysippeo acumine pecudes salvabuntur, quia salutaria cum appetant, virtualiter etiam baptismum appetent" (Serarius 1593, *Contra novos*, pp. 32–33).

the adversary. However, the topic of the final fate of animals and the question of whether animals have a soul were effectively discussed by Pucci in his long controversy with Fausto Sozzini on the nature of Adam prior to sin.[67] That topic was discussed in the sixth argument: in Pucci's opinion, because animals experience sensation, they too had been damaged by the universal consequences of Adam's sin and were therefore also destined to the final "renovation" in virtue of the natural efficaciousness of Christ's benefit.[68] The principle of universal salvation of mankind was part of a great vision of cosmic regeneration, which had followed the decay of the universe as caused by the original sin, and based on the idea of a cosmos penetrated by the light of divine *logos*. Serarius saw a similarity between such ideas and the ones that had been upheld by Bruno ("Italus quidam apostata) some years before in Würzburg, where, between 1586 and 1588, he had stayed during his journey from Paris to Prague.[69] Serarius says that Bruno had defended the argument that animals have rationality and language and that they are able to use them, a theory that provoked laughter.[70] Perhaps Serarius overemphasized some of the ideas that Bruno had expressed in the *Cabala del cavallo Pegaseo*,[71] but his intuition that something was new is nevertheless interesting. We can probably say that Pucci's idea of *logos* as a continuous revelation of the invisible God through light and reason, both of which share his infinite nature and assure the universality of revelation in time and space, is related to Bruno's idea of a correspondence between God's infinity and that of nature, or, as Hans Blumenberg writes, his persuasion that "only the infinite cosmos itself can be the phenomenality, can be such a thing as the 'embodiment' of the Divinity, to think of which as a person—that is, as bound to a definite creature in the world, made actual by a temporal position—is something that the Nolan is no longer able to do."[72] According to Pucci, the universality of salvation by virtue of Christ-Reason's eternal action beyond time or space implies the diminished importance of the historical incarnation.

---

67 See *supra*, chapter 3.3. On the topic of the soul and suffering of animals, see: Muratori 2011, *La caduta*; Muratori (ed.) 2013, *The Animal Soul*; Muratori/Dohm (eds.) 2013, *Ethical perspectives*.

68 Sozzini/Pucci 2010, *De statu*, pp. 41–46.

69 Gorfunkel 1997, *Notizie*.

70 "Fuit, ante annos quinque aut sex, tui non dissimilis, Italus quidam apostata, qui ex Anglia et Gallia, has in Germaniae partes veniens, bestias et ratione et oratione, qua inter se uterentur, praeditas, me cum aliis quibusdam, audiente et ridente, nugabatur; eamque suam philosophiam, quemadmodum tuam tu theologiam, sese multis iam probasse, asserebat" (Serarius 1593, *Contra novos*, p. 33).

71 Ciliberto 2007, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 356.

72 Blumenberg 1983, *The Legitimacy*, p. 551.

Pucci's position is not far from that of Bruno's who, even if regarded in an anti-Christian sense, opposed the uniqueness of the event "that would make of it something like a central point of history, and thus would place in *time* something that cannot be allowed in *space* in Bruno's acentric universe."[73]

Even if we cannot be certain whether Bruno and Pucci met personally, the main historical issue, in my opinion, is the Erasmian thought connecting some of their ideas. Thus, the most important problem to discuss is the significance of the presence of Erasmian topics in their thought and in the culture of their time. Bruno and Pucci never mentioned Erasmus;[74] however, Michele Ciliberto, today one of the most important scholars of Bruno, affirmed that "without the *Adagia* and the *Moriae encomium*, the *Candelaio*, which is a comedy on the various types of folly [...], would be incomprehensible from a literary point of view."[75] Similarly, Luca D'Ascia, an Italian scholar of Erasmus, has recently defined Bruno as "the main, and most heterodox, Erasmian in the sixteenth century."[76] Peter Bietenholz, although excluding Bruno from his "encounters with a radical Erasmus" since Bruno's thought was outside Christianism, acknowledges that "presumably he continued to read Erasmus' books throughout his life and might indeed have found there cautious and qualified support for some of his views and concerns."[77] Given the recent attention to the historical phenomenon of Erasmianism in the late sixteenth century, the comparison between Pucci and Bruno assumes significance. They both avoid explicit references to Erasmus' work, yet demonstrate a non-generic legacy of his thought, suggesting the influence of the radical thinking of the cultural dynamics of the sixteenth century. Frances A. Yates, at the end of her remarks on the relationship between Bruno and Corbinelli, called into question the image of Bruno as an isolated thinker always in conflict with his time, and she suggested that his works could be placed within a unitary political and religious plan, at least partly shared.[78] Similar remarks can be made about Francesco Pucci, often considered a completely isolated heretic without church and without followers,[79] a typical example of those visionaries who,

73 Blumenberg 1983, *The Legitimacy*, p. 552.

74 About Bruno, see Bietenholz 2009, *Encounters*, p. 5. During the Roman trial, when Bruno speaks about his time spent in the St. Domenico Maggiore monastery in Naples, he recalls "certi libri delle opere di san Grisostomo et di san Hieronimo con li scholii di Erasmo scancellati, delli quali mi servivo occultamente" (Firpo 1998, *Il processo*, p. 191).

75 Ciliberto 2007, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 80.

76 D'Ascia 2002, *L'ombra*, p. 69.

77 Bietenholz 2009, *Encounters*, p. 6.

78 Yates 2006, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 135.

79 Barnavi/Eliav-Feldon 1988, *Le périple*, pp. 7–8.

as victims of their own dreams, were unable to accept the end of the great expectations of the early century. Such a historiographical perspective implies a limited understanding of sixteenth-century religious and intellectual experiences outside of official institutions, and denies how much those experiences were "founded on actual needs of that time and that they were destined to become basic elements of the European civilization."[80] In fact, the analysis of the relationship between Pucci and Bruno suggests how the existence of radical ideas influenced by Erasmus' thought, especially that of the infinite amplitude of the kingdom of God, was a real line of thinking against the positions of the inquisitors and Protestant theologians. This line of thinking emerged from historical needs no less relevant than the ones represented by inquisitors and Protestant theologians, providing a considerable contribution to the thought on toleration. In the short term, such ideas did not have the strength to influence religious and civil institutions in order to avoid acts of violence. However, this does not mean that they were not significant in terms of the rise of the modern world. In the second half of the century Erasmus' works were printed less and less,[81] and in Catholic countries they were put on the *Index*.[82] Only a few decades later did the Erasmian hope delineated in *De immensa Dei misericordia* of 1524 become a radical and utopian idea in a Europe torn by religious factions with religious wars just around the corner. Nevertheless, those ideas continued to play important roles in the cultural debate. Inspired by these ideas, Celio Secondo Curione and the "Basel circle," led by Sebastian Castellio, organized a fight against Calvin after the stake of Servet. *De immensa Dei misericordia* was translated into German, English and Spanish and began to be circulated in Italy 1542 thanks to a vernacular version edited by the Carmelite Marsilio Andreasi. It is possible that Pucci was aware of the latter; in any event, his latitudinarianism has its roots in the Erasmian tradition, the thought of Giovanni Pico and in the Origenism of the fifteenth century.

The relationship between the thought of Erasmus and Origen is a very complex issue that is not possible to discuss here; however, it is important to touch upon some aspects of it, such as Origen's *Opera* edited by Erasmus in Basel in 1536[83] and the defence of one of the main principles of Origenism, the salvation of ancient peoples in *Antibarbari*: "if we want to formulate a hypothesis, it will not be difficult for me to prove that or the virtuous pagans have been

80 Rotondò 1966, *I movimenti ereticali* (now in Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, p. 12).

81 Gilly 2005, *Erasmo*, pp. 237–238.

82 See *supra*, 2.1.

83 Origen 1536, *Opera*.

saved or nobody has."[84] At the end of the century subsequent to the posting of Luther's theses and Calvin's *Institutio*, and the consequences that followed, the cultural and religious project of *Antibarbari* seemed obsolete.[85] The vision of a new Christendom, peaceful and tolerant, clashed with the facts; however, the religious history of Europe is more than just the history of its confessionalization. Indeed, those ideas did not die or remain locked in the ivory tower of scholars, but spread throughout Europe beyond institutionalized churches and, without losing strength, became more radical. The best proof of their vitality is that even today we recognize their great importance and regard them as the fundamental ideas of our civil and cultural identity.

4.3 A Lasting Heritage: A Brief History of Puccianism in the Seventeenth Century

While Pucci was in the prison of the Holy Office in Rome, the theological clash between Samuel Huber and Aegidius Hunnius on the principles of divine election and predestination was taking place in Wittenberg.[86] During the years immediately prior to his arrival in Italy and his subsequent imprisonment, Pucci was able to print his major work, *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* (1592), in Gouda in the Netherlands. In this work he defended, in a hundred and twenty *rationes*, the doctrine of the universal salvation of mankind. Based on his belief in an eternal revelation through the wisdom and reason of God, Pucci placed very little importance on sacraments and visible Churches, so that "non dubitandum est, quin singuli ex gentibus non initiatis circuncisione aut baptismo simili modo conlustrarentur, si ingenue colerent et invocarent Deum coeli et terrae singulis affulgentem."[87] This was quite a successful book. In an attempt to reach "tutte le università e academie ch'io posso,[88] Pucci himself distributed the copies personally or sent them with cover letters to personalities and institutions all over Europe. Michael van Isselt, the author of the printed journal *Mercurius Gallobelgicus*, reported the news that the Florentine was working hard on his project: in September 1592 he had been to Frankfurt,

84 Erasmus 2002, *Antibarbari*, p. 133.

85 D'Ascia 2002, *L'ombra*, pp. 7–76.

86 See *supra*, chapter 4.1.

87 Pucci 1592, *De Christi*, p. 42.

88 Francesco Pucci to William Gent in England, Den Haag, 20 August 1592 (Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 326).

Würzburg, and Nuremberg to distribute copies of his book to booksellers.[89] In August of the same year, the famous reformed theologian François Du Jon, recently installed at the university of Leiden, had begun a powerful confutation of *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*. Jacobus Arminius enthusiastically announced this news to Johann Wtenbogaert a few weeks later, writing that it was necessary to "multorum circa istam haeresim fluctuantes mentes pacare."[90] This work, *Catholicae doctrinae de natura hominis iacentis in peccato et gratia Dei ex peccato evocantis omnes communiter* [...] *collatio cum doctrina nova libelli recens admodum editi cuius inscriptio De Christi servatoris efficacitate*, was published at the end of the year by Christophe Plantin's printing house. Du Jon wanted it to be distributed to the United Provinces where Pucci had previously sent his work.[91] Soon after, however, both the Roman and Lutheran Church intervened in the dispute with two of their best controversialists. The Jesuit Nicolas Serarius, professor of metaphysics at the University of Würzburg, published the *Contra novos novi pelagiani et Chiliastae Francisci Pucci filidini errores* in 1593, wherein he accused Pucci of rekindling the Pelagian heresy. In the same year the theologian Lucas Osiander of the University of Tübingen published the *Refutatio scripti satanici a Francisco Puccio Filidino in lucem editi* by Gruppenbach, the same printer who had published the two editions of Huber's *Theses Christum Iesum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum* in 1590 and 1592. This was the book that had started the dispute on predestination that spread throughout Lutheran Germany during the last years of the century.[92] In fact, besides the strenuous promotional activity carried out by the author himself, one of the main causes of the success of *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* was the concomitance between its spread and the preaching of Samuel Huber in Central Europe. Similarities between the two theological proposals increased the resonance of Pucci's work and in many countries of Germany revamped the debate on the efficaciousness of Christ's benefit, and hence the problem of the extension of the kingdom of God. During his final travels in Europe before his fatal return to Italy, Pucci learnt about the events in Switzerland and in Württemberg. In the autumn of 1592 he most probably discovered Huber's *Theses* at the book fair in Frankfurt, and admired it immediately; in fact, from Nuremberg he wrote these words to an unknown friend in Prague: "i più dotti ministri d'Alemagna oggidì, resistendo a' calvinisti e agli scolastici parziali, nostri avversari, vengono nella nostra sentenza:

89 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, p. 225.

90 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, p. 220.

91 Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, p. 227.

92 See *supra*, chapter 4.1, p. 82.

che Cristo è morto per tutti gli uomini, senza eccezione alcuna [...] Veggansi le tesi di Samuele Hubero."[93] Pucci was certain that Christ's second coming was imminent, and therefore believed that the book was a sign of the changing times. He therefore always carried a copy of Huber's *Theses*, publicizing it widely.[94] He also sent a copy to Pope Clemente VIII in the attempt to convince him of his own ideas, as a part of Germany "sviata da Lutero dà segno di miglioramento, cedendo al buon vento che spira in favore di tutto il genere umano."[95] Returning to Rome was a tragic mistake derived from his own eschatological perspective, which did not correspond with the reality of the time. The history of *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* was instead closely connected to the circulation of Huber's works, and the success of the former benefited from the debate caused by Huber's preaching and the spread of his *Theses*.

In April 1584, at the height of the controversy between Huber and Hunnius in Wittenberg, a small book entitled *Controversiae inter teologos wittenbergenses de regeneratione et electione Dilucida Explicatio* circulated in Frankfurt. The work was attributed to a group of theologians from Wittenberg, who were against Huber (Hunnius, Leyser, Gessner). It was probably largely the result of Hunnius' effort to reconstruct the various phases of the debate in order to express his unmistakable and final condemnation of his adversary's theological thought. It was a custom of the time for controversialists to represent the adversary as an enemy of the Church, and as somebody restoring ancient heresies. This time, however, Hunnius included some of Pucci's ideas among the errors reintroduced by Huber, considering them all together as a unitary and coherent doctrine called "Puccianism."[96] It was the first time that this word appeared in the theological debates of the sixteenth century. This shows how the *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* was causing vivid reactions. In fact, the confutation of Lucas Osiander circulated in Tübingen only a few months before the *Dilucida Explicatio*. Osiander had taken part in the Colloquy of Montbéliard and had met Huber in Tübingen while the latter was working on his *Theses*. The universalisms of Pucci and Huber seemed to be two aspects of the same problem within Osiander's theological writings. It was not the case that his *Refutatio scripti satanici a Francisco Puccio Filidino in lucem editi* was printed during the

93 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 336.

94 Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 342).

95 Francesco Pucci to Pope Clemente VIII in Rome, Salzburg, Ianuary 25, 1593 (Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 344).

96 "Ex his itaque hactenus pertractatis apparet luculenter Huberum tale fovere et propugnare dogma quod ex Schwenckfeldianismo, Papismo, Anabaptisticis furoribus et Puccianismo conflatum est" (Hunnius/Leyser/Gesner 1594, *Controversiae*, p. G2v).

dispute against Huber and the theory of universal regeneration of mankind as two parallel battles in opposition to similar kinds of universalism taking place in the Lutheran Church. In the chapter on the controversies of the sixteenth century of the *Epitomes Historiae Ecclesiasticae Centuriae XVI*, Osiander placed Huber's theses next to the confutation of Pucci's "satanic" book, wherein the Florentine not only considered Jews—Christ's enemies—as sons of the universal Church, but also "Ethnicis etiam coelum promittit."[97]

In *Dilucida Explicatio*, Hunnius superimposes the doctrines of Pucci and Huber for polemical purposes. He warns against the danger of a discussion on the principle of the election for final salvation, particularly "posteaquam Franciscus Puccius in fraudem et detrimentum totius Christianae fidei profanum dogma suum ex hoc falso principio universalis cuiusdam omnium hominum electionis et in librum vitae inscriptionis extruxit."[98] He confuses some aspects of their thought and, in addressing the problem of the extension of the kingdom of God, uses the radicalism of Pucci to discredit Huber's theology. Hunnius writes that, in Huber's opinion, all men would be saints from birth, given that their original sin had been forgiven by the virtue of Christ's benefit. On the contrary, the holy scriptures affirm that there is no salvation outside the Church, such as outside Noah's ark during the universal deluge. Following Hunnius, Huber claims that the remission of original sin would also be granted to infidels, unbelievers, and savages; everyone would be equally welcomed into God's arms.[99] Huber never arrived at such a conclusion. Francesco Pucci, however, had claimed that peoples without baptism or circumcision are lighted and saved by God if they ingenuously believe in the Creator of heaven and earth. In fact, the faith of the Centurion and the Magi is the result of natural instinct, which has led every man to the truth since the beginning of time: this light, shining over the whole universe, is the *Logos* or *Reason* of God. This example shows how the core of Pucci's thought reemerged in the middle of the theological struggle against Huber in the Lutheran Church, demonstrating its vitality and underground persistence while its author was imprisoned in Rome.

After examining the thought of Huber and underlining his theological mistakes, Hunnius affirmed that "cum Puccii furoribus coincidunt fundamenta

97 Osiander 1603, *Epitomes*, p. 1099.

98 Hunnius/Leyser/Gesner 1594, *Controversiae*, pp. A5r–v.

99 "Iustificatio et remissio peccatorum generalis, generalis adoptio etc. quae non solius Ecclesiae bonum peculiare, sed omnibus gentibus et populis infidelibus adeoque toti pariter mundo commune est" (Hunnius/Leyser/Gesner 1594, *Controversiae*, p. F4v).

quibus uterque utitur."[100] He depicted the extreme latitudinarianism of Pucci as one of the most dangerous living sources of modern naturalism able to corrupt any religion. Although we do not know whether Hunnius really had direct knowledge of *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*, he was certainly fully aware of the peculiarity of Pucci's thought, its origins in space and time, and its specific historical circumstances. Thanks to his intense activity as theologian and polemist, Hunnius was very influential in consolidating the role of Wittenberg University as the bulwark of Lutheran orthodoxy at the end of the sixteenth century (he died in April 1603). This ideological role increased the importance of the University. Among the theologians who maintained such a theological role was his third son, Nicolaus Hunnius, who continued his father's commitment to the defence of Lutheran orthodoxy. He held the Chair in Theology at Wittenberg in 1617, and distinguished himself for his work as a polemicist, above all against the Socinians and the spiritualists. In 1622 he published a work entitled *Christliche Betrachtung der newen Paracelsischen und Weigelianischen Theology*, wherein he attributed the concept of natural faith in Valentin Weigel to the influence of Pucci.[101] In doing so, he established a link based exclusively on thematic analogies, which could not be supported by historical evidence as Weigel had died in 1588, four years before *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* was printed. From then on the term "Puccianism" began to lose historical connotations and was used more and more frequently to indicate the source of naturalism and indifferentism.

In 1647 the Lutheran Johannes Micraelius (Lütkeschwager) was still speaking about Pucci's latitudinarianism in his *Ethnophronii contra Gentiles de principiis religionis Christianae dubitationes* published in Szczecin, where he taught theology and philosophy. In this work, the title of which recalls the Ethnophroni, seventh-century heretics who tried to unify Christianity with Paganism, he imagines a dialogue among seven characters, each representing a different religious faith, as in the model of *Colloquium heptaplomeres* by Jean Bodin. Besides the latitudinarian Ethnophronius, the Lutheran (Teophilus), the Mohammedan (Achmetius), the Catholic (Romanus), the Jewish (Judas), the Reformed (Helvetius), and the Socinian (Photinus) are recognizable. In the third book, the Socinian speaks with Theophilus about the wide path to final salvation, using some of the *rationes* stated by Pucci in

100 Hunnius/Leyser/Gesner 1594, *Controversiae*, p. G2v.

101 "Der Glaube und das Reich Gottes ist von Natur im Menschen. Diss hat Weigelius von Francisco Puccio" (Hunnius 1622, *Christliche*, p. 200).

De Christi servatoris efficacitate.[102] Later, after Romanus has asked Theopilus whether he considers the universalistic theory of Pucci to be a mistake, the latter shows a good knowledge of the hundred and twenty *rationes* of Pucci, summarizing them efficaciously.[103]

Other evidence that the debate on Puccianism lasted a long time is its mention in the monumental work entitled *Systema locorum theologicorum* by the theologian Abraham Calovius, one of the champions of Lutheran orthodoxy in the seventeenth century. He sided against all theological deviances of his time, producing extensive polemical works aimed at defending the Lutheran Church from every kind of heretical infiltration. He fought against the Socinians, the syncretism of Calixtus' followers, and against the pietist spiritualism of the followers of Jean de Labadie. In the first of the twelve volumes of *Systema locorum theologicorum*, published in 1655, he addressed the topics of the substance of theological thought, the revelation, and the significance of the sacred texts. Here, "Puccianism" is used to denote the notion that every man can save himself even if he follows the teachings of his own religion, whatever it may be. This notion provides the author with some assumptions used in the second part of the book to attack the latitudinarianism of Calixtus.[104]

The discussion on some of the principles of Pucci's thought crossed the boundaries of the Lutheran world. The circulation of *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* and the interest around the three great works of refutation edited by three well-known theologians of the main European Churches (Serarius, Osiander, and Du Jon) caused an unprecedented interest in the work of a single heterodox thinker without an institutional authority and outside of any organized movement, such as Pucci. Additional information on Pucci and his religious proposal circulated in 1668 when the first two volumes of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, containing the *Opera omnia* of Fausto Sozzini, were printed in Amsterdam. Obviously they also contained the writings on the debate with Pucci on the immortal nature of Adam[105] and a long letter of Fausto Sozzini to Matthew Radecke wherein Sozzini provides an accurate description of the life and ideas of the Florentine.[106] Since then this letter

102 "PHOTINUS: Tu vero non videris CXX rationum pondera examinasse, quibus Franciscus Puccius Filidinus Florentinus usus est, ad Christi Servatoris efficaciam in omnibus et singulis hominibus, quatenus homines sunt, demonstrandam. THEOPHILUS: Vidi, legi, improbavi" (Micraelius 1647, *Ethnophronii*, pp. 19–20).

103 Micraelius 1647, *Ethnophronii*, pp. 37–40.

104 Calovius 1655–1677, *Systema*, t. I, p. 123.

105 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, II, pp. 253–369.

106 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, pp. 378–392.

has been used by biographers and scholars as one of the main sources of information on Pucci, whose memory remained alive in Socinian tradition. Given the existence of this letter, anti-Socinians also had the opportunity to discover the thought of Pucci. Adrien Baillet, well known as a biographer of Descartes, was so interested in the Socinians and Pucci that he devoted an entire page of *Jugemens des Savans* to him in a section of *Satires personnelles*, first printed in 1682. He expresses some doubt about Pucci's true identity, perhaps because of the use of contradictory sources: on one hand the Osiander's confutation and the Lutheran tradition, and on the other the debate with Fausto Sozzini and the Socinian tradition. Baillet refers to him as "l'auteur du Puccianisme, c'est-à-dire d'une nouvelle secte qui a duré trois jours et qui est demeurée ensevelie sous les pierres dont elle fut accablée par les Calvinistes, les Luthériens et les Catholiques."[107] Even though Baillet's opinion regarding the duration of the importance of Puccianism seems to be limited, his mention of it and his awareness of the confutations of the three Christian churches demonstrates how Pucci's thought was still alive nearly eighty-five years after his death.

Even more interesting is the position of Pierre Bayle. Bayle uses numerous sources when defining "Puccius" in the *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, first printed in 1697. He cites Baillet as well as the Dutch reformed theologian Gisbertus Voetius,[108] his follower Johannes Hoornbeeck,[109] and the Lutheran theologians Johannes Micraelius,[110] Tobias Psannerus,[111] and Lucas Osiander.[112] Bayle writes that the main doctrine of Pucci "fut que les honnêtes gens seraient sauvés, méme dans le paganism,"[113] emphasizing only one principle of Pucci's theology, the infinite amplitude of the kingdom of God, which, according to Bayle, is enough to label him as a fanatic. Bayle's main interest was to pursue his own polemic against Socinianism, defined by Richard Popkin as his "bête noire."[114] Indeed, he attacked both Socinianism, defined as religious rationalism *tout court*, and every possible attempt to demonstrate the reasonableness of Christianity.[115] Bayle had all the volumes of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*

107 Baillet 1725, *Jugemens*, p. 66.
108 Voetius 1655, *Selectarum*.
109 Hoornbeeck 1650, *Apparatus*, p. 52.
110 Micraelius 1644, *Syntagma*, p. 515.
111 Pfanner 1679, *Systema*, pp. 493–494.
112 Osiander 1603, *Epitomes*, p. 1099.
113 Bayle 1740, *Dictionnaire*, III, p. 827.
114 Popkin 1959, *Pierre Bayle's place*, p. 12.
115 See: Firpo 1973, *Pierre Bayle*.

in his library, and was therefore well aware of the relationship between Pucci and Sozzini and of their debate "de statu primi hominis ante lapsum"; however, the latter was his main interest, not the former. Perhaps for this reason, Bayle concludes his article on Pucci with a rather hasty opinion following Voetius' judgment, describing the Florentine as "nullius religionis, nullius eruditionis literariae, philosophicae, scripturariae."[116]

Early in the next century, Puccianism, the doctrine of the universal salvation of mankind, continued to be discussed within the cultural debate in the Lutheran world without being considered an erudite topic, but rather as a heterodox thought still alive and dangerous. The German historian and theologian Adam Tribbechovius, in his *Historia naturalismi*, published posthumously in Jena at the beginning of the eighteenth century by his son Johannes, lists Pucci among the major followers of Naturalism, since he "probare voluit omnes omnino gentiles et Christi notitia carentes, modo secundum naturae legem vivant, salvari."[117] Tommaso Campanella, with his *Atheismus triumphatus*, Herbert of Cherbury with *De veritate*, and Thomas Hobbes with *De cive* are listed in the same chapter, followed by the well-known René Descartes, who, as the author says, does not need an introduction. Tribbechovius considers Pucci to be a leader of modern Naturalism, his thought a fundamental contribution to its prevalence in the seventeenth century. The importance is emphasized by his decision to provide the reader with more biographical information about Pucci in the appendix with the addition of a part of the letter from Fausto Sozzini to Matthew Radecke[118] from the first volume of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*.

Since being coined by Hunnius, the term "Puccianism" never ceased to be used in Lutheran Germany, although it underwent some semantic changes towards a more paradigmatic meaning for use in theological and philosophical controversies. An example is the work of the theologian Ehregott Daniel Colberg of Greifswald University entitled *Das Platonisch-Hermetische Christentum*, published in Leipzig in 1691. It contains an attack on all the different types of Spiritualism (Paracelsians, Weigelians, Rosicrucians, Quakers, Anabaptists, Quietists, Labadists, and followers of Antoinette Bourignon). Colberg believed that they were linked together by the principle of individual interior regeneration, thanks to reason and nature, and by the idea of neglecting the role of grace. In his opinion, Pucci's thought was especially close to that of Robert Barclay of the Quakers' movement, since they both believed

116 Voetius 1655, *Selectarum*, p. 234.

117 Tribbechovius 1700, *Historia*, p. 47.

118 Tribbechovius 1700, *Historia*, pp. 52–62.

that people who do not know the word of Christ could efficaciously replace it in their hearts with inner illumination.[119] He quotes passages from *De Christi servatoris efficacitate* that contain images of "lux divina, quae Christus est," which "salutariter affulget" inside every man entering the world. In Colberg's work the theological position of the highly observant Lutherans emerges with his opposition to the spreading of Pietism, the most important phenomenon in the history of Lutheranism between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Thanks to its cultural and religious background, this book was a remarkable success. It was reprinted in 1710 in Leipzig, where the debate on Pietism was livelier than elsewhere.

During those years of theological controversies, the issue of the universal salvation of man by virtue of the light of natural reason, the core of Puccianism, became interlinked with the debate on theories and practices inspired by Pietism. Certainly the appearance of Pucci in *Unparteyische Kirchen un Ketzer Historie* by Gottfried Arnold,[120] one of the most eminent figures of the movement, helped underline this link. Puccianism, however, had older origins and a more complex tradition: the rise of Pietism in the Lutheran Church and the debates that followed only contributed new strength and a major visibility. One example is what happened at the University of Leipzig between the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. The intense activity carried out by August Hermann Francke had transformed the neighboring town of Halle into one of the most important centers of the Pietist movement, causing numerous frictions at the University of Leipzig, the headquarters of strictly observant Lutherans.[121] The Chairs were held by rather conservative teachers, including the Carpzov brothers, Samuel Benedict and Johann Benedict II. Samuel Benedict, who had been a friend of Francke, later became one of his opponents together with Johann Benedict. In 1690 they instigated an accusation of Pietism against Francke, which resulted in his suspension from his lectureship. A more moderate position that retained respect for Lutheran orthodoxy was held by Thomas Ittig. He intervened in the so-called "terministischen streit", i.e., the debate regarding whether there is a time prior to death beyond which it is no longer possible to be converted ("terminus gratiae peremptorius"). He firstly defended the position of Christian Reineccius against the pietistic teachings of Johann Georg Böse, then clashed with Adam Rechenberg, who had developed some Böse ideas. Some Leipzig theologians

119 Colberg 1710, *Das Platonisch-Hermetisches Christenthums*, pp. 631–633.

120 Arnold 1740, *Unpartheyische*, p. 1535.

121 On the relationship between Leipzig University and Pietism, see: Kevorkian 2007, *Baroque Piety*; Petermann 2007, *Die Universität Leipzig*; Shantz 2013, *An introduction*; Shantz (ed.) 2015, *A companion*.

accused others of Puccianism, by which they meant the theory that men could reach eternal life without divine grace.[122] Reineccius' book *Bösianismus per responsa et testimonia theologorum condemnatus*, published in Leipzig in 1704, opened with an extensive preface written by Thomas Ittig (thirty-six sections on forty-seven pages *in folio*). He reconstructed the history of Puccianism, starting from a well-documented biography, followed by a summary of opinions of several Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic authors on Pucci's theological thought and concluding by considering the role of Puccianism within the debate on grace among the theologians of Leipzig University. In the opening, Ittig emphasizes how Adrien Baillet, in his *Jugemens des savans*, mistakenly predicted a short life for the sect ("a duré trois jours"), showing how the facts demonstrate its tenacious survival in European religious history.[123] Given the polemic aim of his writing, he used the term "Puccianism" instrumentally. He was fully aware, however, of the historic origins of the doctrine, affirming that it had not been created by Satan but by a flesh and blood man, Francesco Pucci, who had taught his ideas at the end of the sixteenth century and published a book entitled *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*. Ittig also provided a summary analysis of the book, underlining the relationship between Pucci and the Socinians.

A few years after Ittig's work was released, Puccianism had become the only topic of a small printed book, *Puccium in naturalistis et indifferentistis redivivum*, also published in Leipzig in 1712. Its author was the philosopher and theologian Johann Schmid, an orthodox Lutheran who had been taught by Johannes Olearius, Johann Benedikt Carpzov II, and Jakob Thomasius.[124] This book extensively used the same contents as Ittig's preface, but the author dealt with the topic without immediate polemical purposes (such as the reaction against the teaching of Georg Böse found in Ittig's preface), providing a comprehensive analysis of Puccianism as a source of heterodoxy in the theological and philosophical thought of the modern age. The work is divided into four sections: the first is devoted to the life and work of Pucci; the second provides an explanation of the basic idea of his teachings using quotations from *De Christi servatoris efficacitate*; the third consists of a list of all those who had

122 De Gaspari 1776, *Commentarius*, p. 49.

123 Ittig 1704, *Bösianismus*, A2r.

124 Johann Schmid (1649–1731) was professor of eloquence (1685–1700) and then of theology (1700–1731) at the University of Leipzig. His name is also linked to an episode in the life of Johann Sebastian Bach, who was examined by Schmid in theology in May 1723 before being granted the position of Cantor at St. Thomas School. See, for example: Wolff 2000, *Johann Sebastian Bach*, p. 240.

recently brought his ideas to light; and the fourth seeks to prove the dangerous fallaciousness of Puccianism. The first section is not particularly different from Ittig's preface, and the biographical information is practically the same. The second section, however, starts with an interesting introduction wherein Schmid takes a remark from Arnold and affirms the existence of two different positions among theologians similar to Puccianism: some claim that, according to Pucci, man could reach final salvation only through natural light; others state that, when Pucci talks of "natural light," he does not refer to something from nature, but rather to the inner light of faith, the Christ.[125] Among the latter was Arnold himself, with whom Schmid disagrees. It was a delicate issue reflecting the broader debates on Pietism that had taken place in Germany over the last two centuries. Arnold's interpretation and Schmid's position, which focused on a central problem of pietism, present the main topic of Pucci, reshaped and readapted to their own times. This historical source provides a limited understanding of the real thought of Pucci, but it is crucial to highlight how such a thought was received in later centuries. Pucci's failed attempt to generate a debate on the question of universal salvation was not simply the whim of a lonely thinker at the end of the sixteenth century; it touched a focal point of the European mind.

The third section offers interesting opportunities for further remarks. Here the author resumes and develops some of the content of the *Historia naturalismi* of Adam Tribbechovius, placing Puccianism at the center of heterodox thought of the seventeenth century. The relations established among the authors mentioned are based on an analogical perspective and consider only thematic similarities, ignoring any historical and philological connections. Puccianism is accused of being at the foundation of all doctrines that diminish the importance of divine grace for salvation, and therefore of infinitely extending the boundaries of the kingdom of God, particularly those doctrines that in the seventeenth century were referred to as "Naturalism" and "Indifferentism." Schmid defines these two terms: Naturalists believe that the knowledge of God imprinted by nature in every man's heart is effective for gaining salvation and, therefore, the Gentiles who lived rightly are saved; Indifferentists believe that salvation is attained in every religion since it is not strictly necessary to know the word of Christ.[126] These definitions are followed by a list of authors who,

125 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. B4r.

126 "Per Naturalistas autem hic eos intelligimus, qui revelationem divinam simpliciter creditu necessariam esse inficiantur, sed notitiam Dei naturalem omnium cordibus inscriptam ad salutem consequendam sufficiere existimant, ac gentilibus juxta rectae rationis dictamen viventibus aeternam salutem promittere non verentur. Indifferentistarum vero

in Schmid's opinion, belong to one or the other school of thought, and hence are all followers of Puccianism.

The list begins with Jean Bodin, who converted from one religion to another without hesitation and put into practice the teachings of Pucci. Schmid recalls his *Colloquium Heptaplomeres*, where the author argues the efficaciousness of natural religion.[127] Bodin is followed by Herbert de Cherbury, with his three books *De veritate, De religione gentilium*, and *De causis errorum*, and then by Thomas Hobbes. Some pages of Spinoza are also accused of Puccianism such as the ones from chapter XIV of *Tractatus teologicus-politicus* where the author writes that "qui iustitiam et charitatem amant, eos per hoc solum fideles esse scimus."[128] Subsequently Schmid speaks about chapter VIII of *De religione naturali* of Protestant theologian Petrus Chauvinus.[129] Then it is the turn of the Arminians, beginning with Étienne de Courcelles, successor of Simon Episcopius at the Seminary of Remonstrants in Amsterdam, and translator of Descartes. In his *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, he writes that virtuous Gentiles will be saved, as well as those who, after Christ's incarnation, "nulla sua culpa in eum non crediderunt, quia ipsis revelatus non fuit," such as peoples of recently discovered lands.[130] The same idea is also found in the *Theologia Christiana* of Philipp van Limborch.[131] The longer the list grows, the more heterogeneous it becomes: the Jesuit Jacob Masen[132] is placed next to the anonymous author of *De ratione humana* (the English author Martin Clifford and his *Treatise of humane reason*)[133] and the German

---

nomine in praesenti illos innuimus, qui homines in quacunque religione ad salutem aspirare posse contendunt, atque adeo notitiam Christi Salvatoris ad salutem obtinendam minime necessariam esse aperte profitentur" (Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, pp. C2r–v).

127 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, pp. C3r–v.

128 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D1r.

129 Schmid 1714, Puccium, pp. D1r–v. See: Chauvin 1693, *De Naturali Religione*.

130 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D1v. See: Curcellaeus 1675, *Opera teologica*, pp. 389, 455.

131 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D2r. See: Limborch 1586, *Theologia Christiana*, pars IV, caput XI, 11, pp. 362–363.

132 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D2v. Iacobus Masen deals with the issue "an et quo modo quivis in religio sua, etiam gentilium, salvari posse" in his book: Masen 1672, *Utilis curiositas*, caput XXI, pp. 318 ff.

133 The first edition of *A treatise of human reason* was published anonymously in London in 1674. *A Treatise* was published again in the following year, with the name of the author, both times in London. However, Schmid quotes from the note in Grosse/Gleditsch 1683, *Acta eruditorum*, pp. 306–307. This note refers to the French version of the book (Clifford 1682, *Traité*). The editors of *Acta* underline that the author of *Traité* speaks about a universal religion "ex universali rationis principio, ex quo vere divinum lumen etiam sine auxiliis gratiae satisque aptum ad cognoscendum et colendum Deum deducunt" so that

philosopher Johann Angelius Werdenhagen next to the Quaker Robert Barclay and his *Theologiae verae Christianae Apologia*.[134] Moreover, the thought of the Anglican clergyman William Sherlock who, in *A practical discourse concerning future Judgment*, says that man will be saved not by virtue of his own religious creed, but by means of the works he has done,[135] is considered not far from that of the mystic Antoinette Bourignon, since she also believed in the principle of the salvation of the Gentiles,[136] and from Pierre Poiret, who in his *Irenicum universale* and in *Fides et Ratio collatae*, says that all men can reach eternal life in any religion.[137] At the end of the list are the German Pietist Johann Conrad Dippel and another mystic, Johann Wilhelm Petersen,[138] and finally, even if only briefly mentioned, La Mothe Le Vayer, Sebastian Castellio, Caspar Barlaeus, and Henricus Nicolaus van De Poort.[139]

In the fourth section, having proved the theological mistakes of some of Pucci's main statements, Schmid ends this small book by providing a summary, *Corollariorum Heptas*, wherein he conclusively explains the meaning of Puccianism in seven points. The polemical nature of his conclusion is shown in the passage where he writes, quoting Ittig, that Puccianism is the doctrine of those "qui cum Puccio consentiunt, sive post sive ante ipsum vixerint,"[140] thus a heresy without a historical connotation outside of time and space. Elsewhere Schmid shows a clear historical awareness of this doctrine; in fact, he first distinguishes the historical teachings of Pucci from Puccianism (a development from the only argument "quo homines quosvis in sua religione salutis compotes fieri posse"[141]), then adds that, even if many others before Pucci had taught that men can be saved by the natural light, only Pucci had passionately

---

"nec Turcis, nec idololatris, nes ipsis athei coelum claudatur" (Grosse/Gleditsch 1683, *Acta eruditorum*, p. 306). About Martin Clifford see: Tarantino 2000, *Martin Clifford*; Tarantino 2012, *Martin Clifford*.

134 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D3r. Schmid considers especially the thesis X: "Possint igitur huius catholicae ecclesiae membra esse etiam inter gentiles, et Turcas et Iudaeos et ex omnibus Christianorum sectis, homines scilicet bonae integritatis et simplicitatis cordis" (Barclay 1676, *Theologiae verae*, pp. 63).

135 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, pp. D3r–v. See: Sherlock 1652, *A practical discourse*. However, Schmid refers to a note in Grosse/Gleditsch 1693, *Acta eruditorum*, pp. 262–267.

136 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D3v. But see: Grosse/Gleditsch 1686, *Acta eruditorum*, pp. 15–16.

137 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, pp. D3v–D4r. See: Poiret 1702, *Irenicum*, p. 353; Poiret 1707, *Fides*, acc. III, pars II, sectio VIII, p. 440 ff.

138 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D4r.

139 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. D4v.

140 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. F4r.

141 Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, p. F3v.

defended this theory and disseminated it all over Europe.[142] Such an awareness makes this document an interesting historical source.

Pucci's latitudinarianism had attracted the attention of Lutheran theologians engaged in the struggle against Huber. Between the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, the theological thought of the Italian exile was reduced to the single issue of the universal salvation of mankind thanks to the natural knowledge of God. It was in this context that the word "Puccianism" was coined. The meaning ascribed to this word was related to one of the main issues of the philosophical and theological debate of the seventeenth century, which expressed the need to reconsider the notion of civilized society. For over a millennium civilized society had coincided with Christendom or, in other words, with the notion of the kingdom of God. Outside of the "closed world" of Christendom were the unbaptized, including Muslims, Jews, ethnics and Gentiles. However, the break of Christendom, the end of the universal authority of the Church of Rome, and the discovery of unexplored lands had undermined this conception of civilized society. The intellectual crisis caused by the Reformation, as it was called by Richard Popkin, on one hand reopened the discussion on the principle of truth (not only from a theological point of view);[143] on the other hand it compelled the consideration of new criteria that was more effective and more inclusive, restating the notion of human dignity and human society in modern Europe. At the end of the sixteenth century Pucci's latitudinarianism was able to summarize this complex question in a very synthetic way, and the continuing debate on Puccianism illustrates the catalyzing strength that such an idea maintained until the Age of Enlightenment. Although Schmid's work has polemical purposes, his reconstruction really follows the ways in which this idea was received and adapted over time, passing through underground zones of heterodox thinking (Indifferentism, Naturalism, Spiritualism and, even more indefinite, Spinozism), recently grouped together under the notion of Radical Enlightenment.[144] In the early eighteenth century the hopes that had

142 "Quamvis etiam multi iam ante Puccium docuerint nomine solius luminis naturalis ductu salvari posse, cum tamen dogma istud Puccius prae caeteris magno studio atque conatu defendere non tantum, sed etiam propagare studuerit, Puccianismus inde non male nuncupatur" (Schmid 1714, *Puccium*, pp. F3v–Gr).

143 See *infra*, chapter 5.1.

144 The expression "Radical Enlightenment" was used for the first time in 1981 by Margaret Jacob (Jacob 1981, *The Radical*). Its meaning has been increased by Jonathan Israel in his trilogy of books on the construction of Modernity (Israel 2002, *Radical Enlightenment*; Israel 2006, *Enlightenment Contested*; Israel 2010, *A Revolution of the Mind*).

induced Pucci and many others of his generation to leave their native countries to travel across Europe for different reasons (including religious freedom, seeking true religion, and waiting for a great council or the return of Christ), disappeared. However, during this long journey, the sixteenth-century debate on the infinite extension of the kingdom of God gradually transitioned into a debate on a new idea of man. And a new idea of man finally emerged, free from the need of a religious belief and closer to the secular principles of equality and universal brotherhood, all inscribed in his own nature. This new idea of man will be appreciated in the age of Enlightenment.

CHAPTER 5

Christian Francken and the Skepticism of the Sixteenth Century

5.1 The Descent of Christian Francken "in immensum"

Richard Popkin wrote that the fundamental issue raised by Luther following the Leipzig Disputation in 1519 was the need for a new *regula fidei*.[1] After refusing the authority of the pope and tradition, he only recognized the authority of Christian conscience above the Holy Scriptures, causing the so-called intellectual crisis of the Reformation. In this way the problem of the *regula fidei* became not only a religious problem, but also a problem of how to find a general and unquestionable criterion of truth, as there was a revival of interest in the skepticism of the ancients. In Popkin's opinion, the revival of skepticism and the Pyrrhonian crisis during the Early Modern Age was mainly due to the rediscovery of the works of Sextus Empiricus. He underlined the connection between skepticism and fideism, which could already be found in the religious anti-intellectualism of Erasmus, who had used skeptical topics, particularly academics, to defend a faith based on the *imitatio Christi*—rather than theology—and on the authority of the Catholic Church. These two ideas made a remarkable contribution to studies on modern skepticism, yet they also raised several objections. They were called into question by Charles B. Schmitt, who demonstrated how academic skepticism had had a more lasting influence than Pyrrhonian.[2] Moreover, studies on atheism in the Early Modern Age had developed remarkably since the last quarter of the twentieth century,[3] demonstrating the scathing effect of skepticism on the foundations of religion in the thought of many authors such as Pierre Charron and François de La Mothe Le Vayer. The late sixteenth century case of the ex-Jesuit, later Socinian, Christian Francken, is a good starting point for new remarks on these topics.

1 Popkin 2003, *The History*, pp. 4–5.

2 See, for example: Schmitt 1967, *Gianfrancesco*; Schmitt 1972, *Cicero*. See also: Popkin/Schmitt (eds.) 1987, *Scepticism*.

3 See, for example: Moreau (ed.) 2001, *Le scepticisme*; Paganini (ed.) 2001, *The Return*; Bernier/Charles (eds.) 2005, *Scepticisme*; Paganini 2008, *Skepsis*; Paganini/Maia Neto (eds.) 2009, *Renaissance*; Maia Neto/Paganini/Laursen (eds) 2009, *Skepticism*.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004335783_006

The main characteristics of Christian Francken's thought were inconstancy and doubt. In his last printed work, *Analysis rixae Christianae*, published in Prague in 1595 when he was forty-five years old, Francken outlines his restless life: "Decimo quinto iam anno post meum ex Societate Iesu discessum incertis sedibus vagor, non aliam ob causam, quod nec sacerdotium, nec coniugium, quibus duobus vitae generibus homines certo fere loco alligantur, amplecti unquam ausus fuerim. In vaga autem hac vita mea summum meum hoc tantum fuit peccatum, quod scribendi quadam usurpata libertate, eiusmodi fuerim casibus iactatus."[4] The only "sin" he admits is stubborness frankly saying and writing what he believed in. In other words, freedom of thought would have cost him the renunciation of life's comforts and serenity of mind, driving him along a path of suffering and failure. He used words of bitterness, giving vent to the disappointments of a lifetime; beyond their literal meanings, they reveal one of the most important historical implications of sixteenth century religious radicalism, the struggle for the religious freedom to discuss the Holy Scriptures and dissent. The Catholic Counter-Reformation and the establishment of confessional orthodoxies in the Protestant world, especially after the middle of the century, forced those who defended the right to free interpretation of the Bible to flee. They sought safety where more toleration was granted: first in Switzerland, later in Eastern Europe, particularly Poland and Transylvania. The 1553 execution of Servetus at the stake in Geneva and the large debate on toleration that ensued created a watershed between the two periods. Christian Francken followed the same routes after leaving the Society of Jesus in 1579; he traveled from Geneva to Basel, Altdorf to Nuremberg, and Wrocław to Krakow, Cluj and Prague, changing his faith as he went, always dissatisfied and intolerant of hierarchic authority.[5] Originally a Jesuit, he became drawn to Calvinists and Lutherans before joining the Anti-trinitarians, sharing the more radical ideas of the so-called Nonadorants. Finally, disillusioned and full of doubt, he decided to submit to the authority of the Roman Church and accepted the Inquisition's judgment. He was tried and sentenced to life imprisonment, and ended his days in the prison of the Holy Office.

Christian Francken was born around 1552 in Gardelegen, near Magdeburg in Saxony, to a middle-class family of Lutheran faith. We know nothing of his youth, except that he was converted to Catholicism at the age of sixteen

4 Francken 1595, *Analysis*, B4v; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 292, ll. 32–38.

5 The best Francken biography is: Szczucki 1977, *Philosophie*. An updated bibliography on Francken in: Wijaczka 1991, *Christian Francken*. See also: Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*; Biagioni 2014, *Christian Francken*. Francken is mentioned also in: Prosperi 2016, *La vocazione*, pp. 231–232.

when he entered the Jesuit college in Vienna. He studied in Rome and Naples, but the religious life in Italy made a bad impression on him because it was ruled by vanity, credulity, and power logic. When he returned to the Jesuit College of Vienna in 1576 as a teacher of philosophy, he had more doubts than certainties. His encounter with the young and brilliant colleague of theology, Paul Florenius, was the last straw. Both men were intolerant of Jesuitic formalism, especially of the strict obedience rule even in the face of absurd dogmas. They were in search of a more rational religion. A deep friendship was born between them, in Francken almost a veneration. In 1578 Florenius left the Society of Jesus. Francken followed him shortly after, tortured by doubt and remorse. In 1579 in Leipzig he published his first work, *Breve colloquium Jesuiticum*,[6] where he reconstructed and explained the reasons that had led to his painful decision. It was a much appreciated work in the Protestant world, where it was read as an anti Jesuit document and reprinted a dozen times, with editions in English and German.[7] However, beyond the furious attack against the Society of Jesus, which he accused of encouraging idolatry and paganism, Francken showed signs of a deeper inner crisis that was leading him to question the foundations of religion.

Between 1579 and 1581, Francken sought a religion without the credulity of Catholicism, first in the Reformed church and then in the Lutheran. In 1580 in Basel he re-published the *Breve colloquium Iesuiticum* along with two new writings, *De praedestinatione* and *De bestialissima idololatria*,[8] at the printing house of Pietro Perna, a meeting place for the exiles *religionis causa*, especially Italians.[9] From there he went to Strasbourg, where he disputed with the Lutheran theologians Johann Marbach and Johannes Pappus on the doctrine of Christ's ubiquity. In the autumn he received the chair of philosophy at Altdorf university, but even there he raised a bitter controversy by criticizing the thought of Petrus Ramus. After spending some time in Nuremberg during the second half of 1581, a victim of despair and remorse once more, he arrived in Wrocław. Here he met Andreas Dudith, the Hungarian humanist, who had been private secretary to Cardinal Reginald Pole and then become a bishop himself before leaving the Catholic Church to learn more about the Anti-trinitarians. Francken was deeply disappointed by the churches of the Reformation. He sought a religion without mysteries, but had met only coarse theologians who were astonished by his will to get to the bottom of

6 Francken 1579, *Breve colloquium* (now also in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 159–177).

7 Biagioni 2014, *Christian Francken*, pp. 19–25.

8 Now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 179–195.

9 See, especially: Rotondò 1974, *Pietro Perna*; Perini 2002, *La vita*.

religious questions; they were convinced that "nec prius mihi credendum quam a multo vino vel cerevisia bibenda et ab uxore ducenda non amplius abhorrerem."[10] He was uncertain whether to proceed with his search or to return to the Church of Rome. He wrote a letter to the Jesuits of Vienna, declaring that he had repented of his mistake, but their hostile response (they published the letter, which cast him in unfavorable light among Protestants) and, perhaps, the influence of Dudith, led him towards Poland, where he joined the Anti-trinitarians.

Francken headed to Poland for two reasons: the hope of finding more freedom and escaping the servitude that, in his opinion, was afflicting the whole Christian world so that "nullus umquam immanissimus ethnicus tyrannus optare ausus fuit";[11] and, as suggested in the *Breve colloquium Iesuiticum*, where he had condemned the Trinitarian dogma because he considered it a residual of the ancient heathen polytheism, to search for a rational religion. On one hand, he continued the controversy against the Catholics by accusing Canon Krzysztof Warszewicki of fomenting intolerance with his Counter Reformation propaganda.[12] On the other hand, in 1584 he disputed with Fausto Sozzini, the main figure of the Anti-trinitarians in Krakow, on the topic of the lawfulness of the adoration of Christ. Unlike Sozzini, Francken refused the possibility of venerating Christ because it was in contrast to the denial of his divine nature (according to the basic principles of Anti-trinitarianism): his materialistic vision did not admit any exception. The heated debate between Sozzini and Francken took place in the residence of Krzysztof Morsztyn, a friend and patron of Sozzini in the village of Pawlickowice, not far from Krakow, and it ended in total disagreement.[13] Shortly after, Francken published his major theological writing, the *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum*,[14] in which he defended the strict idea of the uniqueness of God wherein Christ's role was remarkably reduced, an idea found in the teachings of Ferenc Dávid, the acknowledged master of the Non-adorants. In May 1584, the synod of Węgrów formulated a condemnation of his ideas, so Francken decided to move to Transylvania where he stayed with János Gerendi, a leading figure among Non-adorants.

The second half of the eighties was a period of particular inner suffering for Francken. He obtained a teaching position in the Unitarian College of Cluj

10 Francken 1582, *Epistola*, A4r; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 198, ll. 32–33.

11 Francken 1584, *Praecipuarum enumeratio*, [3r]; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 244, l. 3.

12 Francken 1584, *Epistola* (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 205–211).

13 See: Francken 1656, *Disputatio* (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 213–241).

14 Francken 1584, *Praecipuarum enumeratio* (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 243–258).

and devoted his lessons to expounding the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus.[15] Within a short time, however, he had once again fallen prey to despair because of new doubts developed under the pressure of the Jesuits. He left Cluj and returned to Krakow, where he succeeded in convincing the Jesuit father Piotr Skarga of his sincere repentance and of his deep desperation. On December 4 he recited his public abjuration in the church of Santa Barbara, thus returning to the Catholic Church, at least in formal terms; Francken was in fact very far from a true and final certainty. In 1587 he had a public dispute in Krakow with the Franciscan friar Morus Saracenus from Fossombrone concerning the reasons for dissent among Christians. He also became acquainted with the writings of Sextus Empiricus, which reinforced the skeptical tendencies of his thought. The topic of the uncertainty of religion (and of the knowledge) forms the core of his *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, on which Francken had been working since 1588, and of part of the *Spectrum diurnum genii Christiani Francken*, written between the end of 1590 and the beginning of 1591.[16] In the summer of 1587 he met the Italian exile Francesco Pucci in Prague, who he may have encountered a few years earlier during his stay in Krakow. Together they visited John Dee and Edward Kelley, the former an alchemist and the latter a necromancer, with the aim of attending their angelic visions.[17] Francken's materialistic beliefs, however, made him immune to such superstition, so he subsequently wrote a sarcastic work on the presumed angelic visions of Saint Ignatius of Loyola.[18] He had also come close again to the Anti-trinitarians and resumed his previous place in the Unitarian College of Cluy, albeit for a very short time: in 1591 in Alba Iulia, Francken abjured his errors for the last time before the Prince of Transylvania, Sigismund Báthory, and submitted once again to the authority of the Roman Church. He then spent some years in Prague in the suite of the imperial advisor Anselm von Vels; however, he wanted to be examined by the Inquisition in Milan, perhaps on the advice of the papal nuncio Cesare Speciano.[19] We know that his name was on the list of prisoners held at the Holy Office in Rome in January of 1600, and that in the following May he was sentenced to life imprisonment. Francken was overcome by despair and tried to commit suicide. The latest record of his presence in the prison dates back to 1610.[20]

---

15 See: Biagioni 2014, *Christian Francken*, pp. 100–104.

16 Now published in Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 151–203.

17 See: Pucci 1955–1959, *Lettere*, II, pp. 161–172; Firpo 1952, *John Dee*.

18 Francken 1589, *Mirabilium visionum* (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 263–271).

19 Szczucki 1977, *Philosophie*, p. 237. Francken spoke about Speciano in Francken 1595, *Analysis*, C2v (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 294).

20 See: Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 10n.

Why did Francken undergo so many conversions in so few years? Was he a superficial man or an opportunist? His fits of despair and the events of his life seem to rule out these conjectures. Most likely, after failing in his quest for a rational religion, he had reached a religious indifference not far from atheism, which had driven him to accept the authority he knew best: the Catholic Church. Already in 1583 he regretted having deserted the Society of Jesus and, distressed by his experience in the Protestant world, represented himself as a sailor who had left a quiet port to venture "in altum mundi huius mare" and, having lost his route, "incerto et errabundo animi cursu in immensum vagabar."[21] Life seemed like a deep sea, an overwhelming infinite space that was the disquieting result of his quest for truth outside the Roman Church. The infinity of which he spoke did not seem to be God's majesty, but an abyss of knowledge. His willingness to deny truths established by others and his dismay, even more so than his lack of certainty, demonstrate that his path in search of absolute truth stemmed from a gnoseological need more than a strictly religious one. From the very beginning his thought centered on the problem of the foundation of knowledge, which, due to the Reformation, arose from the crisis of traditional authorities, and included the problem of what criterion ought to be used to define truth and support the existence of God.

5.2 Christian Francken and the Criterion of Truth

Francken's interest in the problem of the criterion of truth is found in documents dating from his dispute with Fausto Sozzini *De honore Christi* in 1584, written after he moved to Poland and joined the Anti-trinitarian Church. Francken opens the debate requesting that each statement be proved using reason and without resorting to Scripture, which was often twisted in theological controversies.[22] At first Sozzini agrees, claiming that true theology cannot contradict reason.[23] Shortly after, he quotes from the Scriptures. Francken immediately refers to the *regula fidei*, since he could deny all the passages referred to by Fausto. He concludes: "Quis igitur nobis praebebit regulam ad quam moderemur hanc diversitatem"?[24] Sozzini, contradicting his own opening

21 Francken 1582, *Epistola*, B3v–B4r; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 201, ll. 29–32.

22 "Non pugnabo tecum sacrae Scripturae testimoniis, quae detorqueri possunt, atque adeo ab omnibus nunc, etiam absurdissimis sectariis, detorquentur ad victoriam, sed agam ratione, si placet" (Francken 1656, *Disputatio*, p. 767; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 213, ll. 14–16).

23 "Placet: quia vero ratio non est contraria theologiae verae, sed verum vero tam consentit et favet, quam album albo et pulchrum pulchro" (Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 213, ll. 26–27).

24 Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 215, ll. 39–40.

statement, replies that the only rule that can settle a theological controversy is the correct interpretation of the Scriptures, according to the fundamental principle of his exegesis, based on the philological analysis of text. The same topics are dealt with in *De sacrae scripturae auctoritate*,[25] probably written around 1580 after discussions with Andrea Dudith. Sozzini therefore denies any possibility of a natural knowledge of God, claiming that the only truth is revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Reason, therefore, has an instrumental function, since it enables the exact understanding of the meaning of God's word. On the contrary, Francken believed that the meaning of Scriptures was inevitably conditioned by the mind of the interpreters, resulting in an increasing number of interpretations and disagreement amongst theologians. The topic of Fausto is clearly dismissed with these words: "Regula debet esse recta et certa, scriptura autem quatenus ab hoc vel illo homine recte intellecta affirmatur, non est recta et certa regula."[26] It is a peremptory statement existing on the fringe of thought of the Reformation, because it ignores both the topic of the centrality of sacred text (*sola Scriptura*), and that of the divine inspiration of the interpreter at the base of prophetism and spiritualism in the sixteenth century. Francken focuses rather on the problem of the relationship between object and subject in the process of knowledge. His perspective reveals his philosophical background acquired both during his years of study in Rome and while teaching in Vienna from 1576.

In his first printed work, *Breve colloquium Iesuiticum* (1579), Francken was already aiming at finding a religion consistent with natural law and reason, without mystery. Soon after, in *De bestialissima idololatria* (1580), an anti-Catholic work written against the sacrament of the Eucharist, Francken more clearly establishes an indisputable criterion to distinguish truth from falsehood in the interpretation of Biblical texts. He was inspired by the thought of Thomas Aquinas (for example, *Summa theologiae prima pars*, quaestio 1) and writes that: "Theologia autem etsi ea docet quae sunt *supra* rationem et ὑπερφυσικά, non tamen quae contra et ἀντιφυσικά."[27] The conviction that

25 Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, 1, pp. 265–280.

26 Francken 1656, *Disputatio*, p. 768; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 216, ll. 10–12.

27 Francken 1580, *De bestialissima*, p. 68; Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 183–184. The distinction between *supra sensus* (i.e., all that is above the reasonable and sensible world) and *contra sensus* (i.e., all that is against the reasonable and sensible world) had already been discussed in Castellio 1981, *De Arte*, pp. 76–77. See also: Salvadori 2009, *Sebastiano Castellione*, pp. 269–279; Vasoli 2011, *La contestazione*, p. 57. For the history of the relationship between "reason" and "above reason", see: Sina 1976, *L'avvento*. On the problem of knowledge in Tommaso d'Aquino's thought, see: Scribano 2006, *Angeli*, pp. 3–67.

one can establish a universal *regula fidei* was based on his firm belief that religious thought can be cleared of superstition and absurd dogmas, which could confuse believers and submit them to the hierarchical authority of the Roman Church. In this first phase of his intellectual path it is possible to recognize references to the radical reformers who wanted to restore the purity of the Gospel message against the corruption and laws of visible Churches, which they considered eminently political subjects. In addition to Erasmus and Castellio, Francken also believed in the force of reason operating in history, and thought it was possible to find the *regula fidei*. Furthermore, he came from the tradition of Aristotelian rationalism, which he defended more than once (for example, in 1580 in the Academy of Altdorf against its rector Thomas Freigius, a follower of Petrus Ramus' thought). Francken made Aristotelianism the object of his teaching in a series of lectures on the *Organon* of Aristotle for the Polish nobleman Johann Ostrorog and his family (1580). Even his decision to join Anti-trinitarian communities in Poland and Transylvania was the result of a long search for rationality in religious thought, which in his opinion should never clash with the laws of physics. It was the basic principle of *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum* (1584), his major theological work, that caused a great sensation because of the harshness of his attack against the Trinity; however, Francken was doing something more: he was creating a work that demolished theology by rationally examining religious dogmas and revealing their unsustainable paradoxes. After discussing the absurdity of devotion to popes and saints, of predestination, the Eucharist and the adoration of Christ, Francken went on to attack Trinitarian dogma, which he considered to be a remnant of paganism as it preserved the idea of a plurality of gods rather than the absolute uniqueness of the God of Judaic tradition. All the churches were unanimous in condemning his book,[28] considering it to be blasphemous; even Polish Anti-trinitarians found his monotheism to be unacceptable.[29]

Once begun, the demolition process could proceed without limits. The use of *regula fidei*, that is, the removal of obstacles to reason, led Francken to extreme outcomes. Perhaps this descent "in immensum" frightened him. He was torn between the will to continue his dizzying exploration and his need for a safe landing place. He wavered between the Anti-Trinitarians and the Jesuits, abjuring in public twice (in 1585 and 1591), at last returning to the Church of Rome. Along his restless intellectual path he reached a turning point, probably around the years 1587/1588. He publicly debated in Krakow with the theologian and Aristotelian philosopher Morus Saracenus from Fossombrone,

28 Górski 1585, *Pro tremenda*; Valencia 1586, *Libri quinque*; Du Jon 1590, *Defensio*.

29 Biagioni 2014, *Christian Francken*, pp. 89–91.

who belonged to the order of Minor Franciscans, about the causes that fed countless theological controversies. In Francken's opinion, it was because men rely more on reason than on piety and reverence. Morus, however, was convinced that the causes of discord originated in incorrect interpretations of Scripture.[30] This problem became lodged in the center of Francken's thought. It is thought that he most likely wrote the first draft of *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae* following the dispute. He completed the final version, which assembles chronologically distinct texts, in 1593. The *Disputatio* is based on the topics of the debate with Morus, yet deals not only with the problem of the cause of the variety of opinions among Christians, but with the uncertainty of the existence of God or, at least, of his demonstrability. He expounds rational arguments in support of the truth of religion and demonstrates that each has only a probabilistic value, not probative. It is a typical procedure of skepticism that, in this case, resulted in the canceling of every theological certitude.

The final part of the work, probably written sometime after the dispute, has a special importance.[31] It consists of a summary of opinions on religion by ancient writers: Euhemerus, Prodicus, Diagoras of Melos, Critias of Athens, Dion, Stilpon of Megara, Protagoras, and Diogenes. The most interesting aspect is that they are real quotations taken from the *Adversus mathematicos* of Sextus Empiricus,[32] a work that Francken was familiar with at the beginning of the nineties. However, within the dialogue between the theologian and the philosopher written in 1588 soon after the debate with Morus, are many passages very close to those in *Adversus mathematicos*.[33] We do not have enough evidence to determine exactly when he discovered the works of Sextus. Undoubtedly after his encounter with the Jesuit Piotr Skarga and the abjuration in Krakow in December 1585, Francken gradually abandoned his quest for a rational religion, which had characterized the 1584 dispute *De honore Christi* and the *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum*, and begun using reason to prove the non-rationality of religion. At the beginning of the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, he wrote that the aim of the dialogue was to prove "quod certa ratione cognosci non possit hanc vel illam esse veram religionem."[34] The truth of one religion is regarded as a falsehood by another, and there is no evidence to prove who is in error; one can

30 Francken 1595, *Analysis*, B3r–B4v (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 291–292).

31 Keserü 1982, *Christian Franckens*.

32 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 180–181.

33 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 178–179.

34 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 153.

only consider possible reasons, which, in turn, can be contradicted by many other possible reasons.

5.3 Christian Francken and the "Dispute between a Theologian and a Philosopher on the Uncertainty of Christian Religion"

Francken probably began writing the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae* in 1588, freely adapting the topics of his debate with Morus Saracenus into dialogue form. He wanted to prove the uncertainty of theology using philosophical thought as the only instrument capable of conclusively demonstrating the truth or falsehood of every statement. In this way the philosopher tried to show that every assertion believed to be *certain* by the theologian was actually only *possible*. Systematically resorting to doubt was not limited by any restriction protecting the foundations of knowledge. Doubt could be used to carefully examine not only the holy scriptures and dogmas of Christianity, but also the problem of God's existence and the essence of religion. The work is mentioned for the first time in an April 1591 letter to Cardinal Acquaviva where Francken discusses writing "de certitudine religionis" with an inscription to St. Peter. Francken adds, ironically, that he was waiting for an answer from St. Peter, but "nullus mihi contigit nuntius [...] nec spes est fore ut aliquando mittatur. Quare conscindatur."[35] Today we only know of one manuscript copy of this work that, in the frontispiece, bears the title *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*. However, after the *Preludium*, it becomes *Disputatio* [...] *de certitudine religionis Christianae*.[36] There is no inscription to St. Peter, and the copyist writes "Conscripta a Christiano Francken Claudiopoli anno 1593." This probably means that it is a work that was stratified throughout the years.[37] The oldest part is the center, i.e., the real dialogue between the theologian and the philosopher, whereas the *Preludium* and, perhaps, the final collection of thoughts of the ancient philosophers on atheism, were written later. Some biographers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Lipenius, Henning, and Adelung) affirm that a printed edition was published in Cluj in 1593. Johann Christoph Becmann adds that it was reported in the catalogue "Bibliothecae publicae Universitatis Francofurtanae,"[38] but today this volume cannot be

35 Szczucki 1972, *W Kręgu*, p. 267.

36 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 151–153.

37 This is the thesis supported by Bálint Keserü (Keserü 1982, *Christian Franckens*).

38 Becmann (ed.) 1706, *Catalogus*, p. 109.

found.[39] Nonetheless, the first text of the *Disputatio*, printed or handwritten, circulated before 1591, since it was one of the theological works enumerated by Francken himself (therefore already known) in his letter to Cardinal Acquaviva written in the spring of that year. The aim of the debate, as Francken says in the *Preludium*, was to show how the lack of a criterion of truth was the cause of the multitude of religions and all theological controversies. In fact, since mathematics is based on an incontrovertible criterion of truth, its certainties are shared by Christians, Jews, Muslims, and even non-civilized peoples. On the contrary, theological principles are based only on possible reasons, and are therefore questionable.[40] Francken broadened the problem he had debated with Morus Saracenus, as the *Disputatio* concerns not only the certitude of Christian religion, but that of every religion, and even the certitude—or incertitude—of God's existence. We don't know if such a development occurred during the debate or if it was a change that Francken introduced later while he was writing the work. The voice of the philosopher, which seems to represent the point of view of Francken himself, actually reflects some aspects of Morus' thought too, and does not seem to correspond to the mind of a real character, but, rather, functions as a starting point for the replies of the philosopher.

Thirty-seven statements by the theologian and as many replies from the philosopher form the real dialogue. The theologian first supports the truth of Christian religion and its superiority over all other religions with rather traditional topics, then furnishes a list of arguments for the existence of God. The philosopher in turn demonstrates that each can be questioned. The first two concern the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures: they constitute the core of all other topics in the *Disputatio*, because the whole theological thought is based on such a certainty. First of all, the theologian defends the postulate by claiming that the scriptures are full of examples showing that God spoke to the prophets, fathers, and every man through Christ, the Apostles, and priests. The philosopher posits that it is a clear example of the so-called *petitio principii*, since the premise already contains what must be proved; in fact, theologians do not proceed from what they know a little about towards what they know the most about, but from what they believed formerly towards what they believe

39 Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, p. 203; Szczucki 1977, *Philosophie*, p. 222.

40 "Verum cum quaevis religio probabili tantum ratione nitatur, omnis autem probabili ratio everti possit, hinc fit, ut quae aliis certissima Religio videtur, eadem ab aliis tanquam incertissima et falsissima videtur et contemnitur" (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 153).

currently.[41] Their conclusions are therefore not obvious, but believed to be true only by those who want to believe them to be true. Every conclusion, in fact, comes from the firm belief that the Holy Scriptures are God's word; however, this is exactly what must be proven. This is the main evidence that theology is empty and no religion can be rational. Without a criterion of truth everyone can pretend to have a dialogue with divinity for the purpose of obtaining power over people, such as some ancient legislators (Charondas, Zaleucus, Zoroaster, Lycurgus, Solon, Minos, Numa Pompilius, and Muhammad).[42] Religion is purely political in essence. Francken had already addressed this topic during his dispute with Cardinal Warszewicki in 1583 when he had attacked the absolute authority of the pope, which, in his opinion, had not come from the Holy Spirit, but entirely from the world. He unmasked the Counter-Reformation concept of the Roman Church that Warszewicki had defended.[43] The reply to the second statement of the theologian is as crucial. Here he defends the truth of the Christian faith on the basis of the Scriptures themselves; in particular he mentions II Petr. 1:21, where the apostle writes that God spoke through prophets, who were illuminated by the Holy Spirit. The philosopher, on the other hand, mentions Aristotle—*Anal. post.* 1, 2, 72a2—who wrote that man is able to know only what he has perceived with his senses. Nothing, however, is further from perception by the senses than the Holy Spirit speaking through the prophets.[44] Thus, this belief cannot be proved rationally. Here Francken introduces a materialist concept of knowledge, which was at the center of his interests in the following years. A broader wording can be found in *Analysis rixae Christianae* of 1595, wherein he writes that nothing can enter the mind if it does not come from the senses. Even the greatest philosophers, when using abstract concepts, could not avoid resorting to material references which

41 "Hocque vicium in omnibus cernitur theologicis argumentationibus. Nam ipsimet Theologi fatentur se non ostendere ex notiori minus notum, sed ex prius credito posterius creditum. Huiusmodi autem argumenta non faciunt fidem nisi volenti credere, quod vobis prius est creditum" (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 154). Szczucki supposed that such an idea came from Pietro Pomponazzi's thought (Szczucki 1977, *Philosophie*, pp. 224–225).

42 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 155.

43 In Francken 1584, *Epistola*, A4v–B1r (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 209, ll. 3–8). József Simon argued that the source of this issue is Agrippa von Nettesheim 1531, *De incertitudine* (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 155n).

44 "Nam notius nobis est, quod sensui vicinius [...] a sensu remotissimum est sanctos locutos instinctu Spiritus Sancti" (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 156).

have a "corporeum quiddam" and "quod phantasmata solet a philosophis appellari."[45] The word "phantasmata" originated with Aristotle, and was also used by Nicholas of Cusa in *De visione Dei* to explain how the intellect must resort to images coming from the senses that cannot exist without a body. Therefore, the "phantasmata" are extremely varied, and their endless variety explains the variety of opinions that cause religious controversies and give birth to sects and heresies.

The arguments found in the third to the twentieth statements deal first with the primacy of the people of Israel, and of Christians over all other peoples (the third to the fifth), and subsequently with the intrinsic superiority of Christianity over other religions (the sixth to the twentieth). The possibility of the existence of a chosen people is rejected on the basis of a relativistic concept of religion. In his third reply the philosopher says that, since God created the whole world, he cannot be closer to one than another because his wisdom and his power are equally distributed. The people of Israel often benefited from miracles, but this is not proof of them having been chosen "nam gentilium historiae narrant miracula Romanorum, Graeca, Egiptiaca et aliarum nationum."[46] The scriptures claim that God universally reveals himself and that even peoples who do not know the law naturally behave as the law requires (Rom. 11, 14). Moreover, those who follow other laws (such as Christians) are certain that God gave the law to them, so there is therefore no criterion of truth to determine who is in error. In the fifth reply, the philosopher rejects the idea that final salvation is only for a chosen people because, as Paul the Apostle writes (1 Tim, 11, 4), God wants all mankind to be saved. For the same reason, it does not make sense to defend the truth of revelation using the authority of the Church, since other peoples rely on the authority of their tradition to conclude that they were chosen by God.[47]

The same relativistic vision allows the philosopher to demolish all the certainties of the theologian about the intrinsic superiority of the Christian religion. The latter, in fact, claims that it contains nothing false or unsuitable (sixth argument), it teaches a very strict moral in contrast with the pleasure principle (eighth argument), it lasts for ever (tenth argument), and agrees with natural

45 Francken 1595, *Analysis*, A2v (see also in Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 287, ll. 25–26). Perhaps this idea came from the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus. Francken studied this text and published an edition in 1585 (see: Biagioni 2014, *Christian Francken*, pp. 100–104).

46 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 157.

47 "Nec obstat, quod vos dicatis habere verbum Dei, quia proponitur vobis ab Ecclesia. Nam et aliae gentes se credunt populum Dei et verbum suis pro verbo Dei" (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 158).

reason (fifteenth argument). On the other hand, the philosopher defends the wisdom of ancient peoples and of non-Christians: "Socrates contra omnia vitia disserebat, hominem ad virtutem reducebat sicque ad meliorem frugem, et tamen nemo dixerit Socratis esse verbum Dei."[48] The theologian accuses them of having principles contrary to reason and disgraceful customs; the philosopher turns this charge against Christianity, using some ideas formulated by Francken in his previous works. In his sixth reply, after having pointed out that vices and faults are common to all men, Christian or heathen, the philosopher mentions some Christian behaviors and beliefs that are absurd, horrible, and blasphemous. Cherubs, for example, were given the features of men, eagles, lions, and oxen. God gets so angry that he orders the sons of Israel to ravage Egyptians, so the philosopher concludes that "quod secundum legem vestram turpe est, non est turpe secundum aliam, nec est necesse, ut sit turpe vel falsum secundum naturam."[49] It is an estranging perspective already used by Francken, for example, when he describes the cult of the Virgin of Loreto in *Breve colloquium Iesuiticum*,[50] or whenever he uses paradoxes in *Enumeratio*. Here, however, it becomes a structural element of his way of reasoning, closely linked to his relativistic vision. In the twentieth reply, he questions the concept of heresy and the heretic. He says that the heretic's thought cannot be judged unreasonable because it is the result of an individual point of view outside or even against the teaching of the Church.[51] Here the philosopher repeats that neither Church's teaching is based on an incontrovertible criterion of truth, and he uses some of the arguments expounded by Morus in the debate. He had said that the cause of any religious controversy can be found in the Holy Scriptures because nowhere is the meaning of the words unequivocal. Absolute unambiguity is produced by the presence of ten conditions (matter, form, purpose, quantity, quality, and so on), as Aristotle says, but these conditions never combine.[52] Unlike Morus, the philosopher wants to prove that the interpretation of Calvin (concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, for example) and that of the Catholic Church are both plausible and neither one nor the other can be confirmed or disproved irrefutably. The teaching of the Church and the words of the heretic are equivalent in terms of reason.

48 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 161.

49 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 160.

50 Francken 1579, *Breve colloquium*, pp. 31–32 (also in Francken 2014, *Opere*, pp. 175–176).

51 "Haereticus praefert suam intelligentiam intelligentiae Ecclesiae. Ergo eius doctrina est irrationabilis" (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 170).

52 József Simon underlined the relationship between this idea and Aristotelian logic (see: Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 170n).

The subsequent arguments (the twenty-first to the thirty-seventh) deal with the topic of the existence of God. After having questioned the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the superiority of Christianity, and the authority of the Catholic Church, the philosopher begins to destroy the idea of God's existence, or at least of its demonstrability, which comes from ancient or medieval thought. Democritus, Empedocles, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Avicenna are explicitly mentioned. However, the implicit influence of Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, even if they are not mentioned, is even deeper, and Francken generally applies radical criticism to Thomism and Scholasticism, which he had considered the cause of Jesuit sophistries in his previous works. The twenty-first argument is particularly important: the theologian uses the argument of *consensum gentium* to prove that the notion of God is naturally in the mind of every man.[53] The philosopher replies that what is common to all mankind does not always come from nature, but it may have been established by men for the purpose of meeting a common need. Such is the notion of God, which in fact is very different according to various peoples. He denies that there is a divine light shining in the minds of men, and claims, on the contrary, that religions are the consequence of a natural need, as their variety proves. The philosopher rejects the innateness also in the twenty-third argument, where religion is defined as a need not coming from "naturam rationalem, sed secundum imaginationem fingentem vanam."[54] He then examines and refutes all the main attempts of past philosophers to prove the rational necessity of God's existence from the *a priori* proof in *Proslogion* of Anselm of Aosta,[55] to that *ex gradu perfectionis* of Thomas Aquinas,[56] to the "unmoved mover" of Aristotle.[57]

---

53 "Quod omnium mentibus insitum est, id ab ipsa profectum natura censendum est. At omnis gens habet cognitionem Dei. Nam et Graecus et Barbarus cognoscunt Deum. Ergo Deus est" (Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 171).

54 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 172. See: Sextus Empiricus 1569, *Adversus mathematicos*, pp. 274–275.

55 "Deus est, quo nihil maius excogitari potest. Ergo Deus est, quia si non esset, aliquid maius excogitari posset eo" (Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 172).

56 "Datur perfectum et perfectius, ut homo perfectior equo. Ergo datur et perfectissimum, hoc autem non est nisi Deus" (Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 174).

57 "Res moventur ab alio, ut homo ab anima. Ergo vel semper unum movetur ab alio in infinitum, ut homo ab anima, anima ab alio et sic deinceps; vel necesse est deveniri ad unum primum, quod movet et non movetur. Sed impossibile est ut moventia sint infinita. Ergo datur primum movens immobile. Ergo Deus" (Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 176).

The argumentative structure of this part of the *Disputatio* draws on the *Adversus mathematicos* of Sextus Empiricus. The thirty-sixth argument in which the theologian demonstrates with a *reductio ad absurdum* some unacceptable consequences of the negation of God, is a direct quotation from the *Adversus mathematicos*.[58] Francken especially makes use of the chapter *An sint Dii*, wherein Sextus writes that not everything we think corresponds to reality (for example fantasy creatures found in poems). He therefore wonders whether having an idea of gods is proof that they exist. Epicurus says no; skeptics do not think it is proof of their existence or non-existence. On the contrary, those who believe it is proof try to prove it with four categories of ideas: the "consensus omnium hominum," the "ordo mundi et distributio," the "absurda quae consequuntur iis qui Deum tollunt," and the "ablatio rationum quae obiiciuntur."[59] Francken follows the same argument from the twenty-first argument onward, with many textual references[60] and ideas from medieval philosophical thought. At the conclusion, instead of the refutation of ideas against the existence of gods, he introduces a series of thoughts of ancient philosophers on atheism, mainly from the *Adversus mathematicos*:[61] Euhemeros, who believed that gods were powerful men raised to a divine dignity;[62] Prodicus, who equated gods to the beneficial forces of nature;[63] Critias, who believed gods had been invented by great legislators;[64] Diagoras of Melos, who considered a proof of their non-existence to be that blasphemers are not affected by their wrath;[65] and Protagoras, who claimed that it was impossible to establish

58 "Multa sequerentur absurda, si non esset Deus. Non esset Religio, quae scientia est colendi Dei, et rerum divinarum; non sanctitas, quae primo est in eo qui dignus est coli. Deinde in illo, qui digne colit ipsum" (Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 178–179). In *Adversus mathematicos* Sextus had written: "Deinceps autem consideremus etiam modum absurdorum quae sequuntur apud eos qui Deos tollunt de medio. Nam si non sunt Dii, ne religio quidem est solum ex virtutibus. Est enim religio scientia cultus Deorum. Eorum autem quae non sunt, nullus potest esse cultus. Unde eius nulla erit scientia [. . .] Et rursus si non sunt Dii, non est sanctitas, ut quae sit iustitia adversus Deos" (Sextus Empiricus 1569, *Adversus mathematicos*, pp. 274–275).

59 Sextus Empiricus 1569, *Adversus mathematicos*, p. 265.

60 Also the twenty-first argument (Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 171–172) recalled Sextus: "Omnes homines tam Graeci quam Barbari Deum esse estistimant et ideo communi consensu quidem sacrificant et vota concipiunt" (Sextus Empiricus 1569, *Adversus mathematicos*, p. 265).

61 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 180–181.

62 Sextus Empiricus 1569, *Adversus mathematicos*, p. 264.

63 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 264.

64 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 264.

65 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 264.

who and what they were.[66] Francken deliberately and systematically used the text of Sextus, which plays an important role in this phase of his intellectual path. On the other hand, the philosopher didn't want to prove that God doesn't exist, but he did want to claim the same opinion as Sextus, i.e., "non magis autem esse quam non esse Deos, per parem vim adversantium orationum."[67] For this reason he accepted the traditional religion of his country together with its usages and laws; he worshipped gods, and he did not speak rashly about their existence or nonexistence. Francken's position, in this last period of his life, was not very different from his.

Christian skepticism could already be found in sixteenth century religious thought before Francken. In his final work entitled *De arte dubitandi*, Sebastian Castellio had advanced a real theory of knowledge based on a distinction of different levels of intelligibility of religious truth: some dogmas, he wrote, are intelligible and really momentous, while others are doubtful and of little importance. Regarding the latter, a suspension of judgment is necessary until the revelation of truth at the end of time. Castellio and almost every other radical thinker in the sixteenth century based his theory on the assumption that God exists, that he takes care of the world, and that he is infinitely merciful toward mankind. Man cannot understand divine truths over reason, but he must reject dogmas that are against reason and he can try to comprehend those that are within his reach, according to the teachings of Thomas Aquinas, who also influenced Francken until 1584. This principle was based on the idea that human reason is part of the divine *logos* since it shares its divine nature, and this ensures the truth of knowledge. However, the materialistic theory of knowledge that Francken developed after the debate with Morus Saracenus led him in the opposite direction. In the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, he follows the thread of an absolute nominalism which questions every kind of knowledge that does not originate from the senses. Francken definitely distinguishes faith from reason—the similarities to the thought of Duns Scotus are not surprising—and seems to abandon his quest for a reasonable religion, which had until that time been his aim. Although he was acquainted with the work of Sextus Empiricus, he remains within the realm of Aristotelian thought regarding language and argumentative logic, as demonstrated by his frequent references to syllogism. His theory of knowledge stemmed from Aristotelian learning, even though it is characterized by a certain type of sensism and was used to destroy theological certitudes based on scholastic thought. Francken's theory of *phantasmata* is

66 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 265.

67 Simon 2014, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 265.

still far from the novelty of Montaigne, who resorts to the Pyrrhonian notion of phenomenon. The peculiarity of the intellectual experience of Francken consists, above all, in the historically precocious radicalism of his results. In Popkin's opinion, nobody had used skepsis systematically rather than as an instrument of controversy, prior to the publication of Sextus' works in Latin, despite the cases of Gian Francesco Pico and Agrippa von Nettesheim (who had had very little influence) and the general anti-intellectualism of some religious figures (Pole, Sadoleto, and Erasmus), which was still characterized by academic skepticism. In consequence of the editions of Estienne and Hervet, evidence can be found that Sextus' works were known from 1570 onwards in Giordano Bruno (*La Cena delle ceneri*, 1584) and Pedro de Valencia (*Academica*, 1596); however, only Francisco Sanchez (*Quod nihil scitur*, written in 1576) and Michel de Montaigne (*Apology of Raymond Sebond*, on which he started working around 1575/1576), demonstrate a deep consciousness of the difference between academic tradition and Pyrrhonism. We can say that they originated modern skepticism, since they were the first to use ancient sources with originality and with the aim of creating new ways of thinking. In this chronology, the drafting of Francken's *Disputatio* around 1587/1588 is of interest. His final fideist choice, the last abjuration, and his definitive obedience to the Church of Rome seem to have brought Francken closer to the tradition of Christian antirationalism. Life choices, however, are not necessarily the results of strictly rational paths: other causes can often be decisive, such as fear, desire for quiet, tiredness, and disenchantment. After a lifetime of struggling for a Christianity of reason, perhaps Francken needed security and protection. Nevertheless, *Disputatio* is not a simple rhetorical exercitation, nor an attack on Christian rationalism according to the logic of the Counter Reformation. The systematic use of skepsis exerts a real corrosive action on the foundations of religion. The final destruction of every certainty, not only theological subtleties or the authority of the pope, leaves behind a heap of rubble before which the fideist choice does not seem to be the result of victory. However, the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae* is a text full of interpretive pitfalls. The progressive stages of composition, the overlapping of the ideas of Morus and Francken, the polemical aim, and the dialogic form make it hard to reconstruct consistent and organized thought.[68] Apart from that, the work marks a central turning point in the intellectual development of Francken. The path toward the *epoché* perhaps provided a possible

68 On the interpretation of *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, see the debate between József Simon and Mario Biagioni (Simon 2013, *Metaphysical*; Biagioni 2013, *Christian Francken*).

solution for Francken, who was hesitating between the rational denial of the existence of God and true religion and the need for a faith resistant to doubt. He also dealt with the problem of atheism,[69] not only as a reaction to the charge of his opponents,[70] but as a deduction that the only reasonableness of religion is the lack of reasonableness.

5.4 Christian Francken and the Sixteenth-Century Origins of the Treatise "De tribus impostoribus"

In the confutation of the *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum* published in 1590 in Heidelberg by the Reformed theologian Franciscus Junius, Poland was defined as a country where Satan spread darkness and obscured the views of experts by means of fraud, preventing them from being able to distinguish the knowledge that God constantly showed them that they needed in order to be saved.[71] It was not surprising, in his opinion, that a blasphemous Polish pamphlet resulted. The countries of Eastern Europe had become the best refuge for the exiles *religionis causa*, especially in the last quarter of the century. There the Anti-trinitarians established their communities, since it was the only place where they were able to organize a Church independent of Calvinists and Lutherans. At the end of the century, because of their attempts to re-conquest, a threatening image of Poland, Moravia, and Transylvania as countries where heresy proliferated was widespread in the propaganda of the Catholic and Reformed Churches. The endless repertory of heresies drawn up in *De Atheismis et Phalarismis Evangelicorum libri duo* by Stanisław Reszka (Rescius), who had been the secretary of Cardinal Osius and was a very experienced man regarding the events of Poland, was used to prove that every type of religious deviance unavoidably led to atheism. According to the testimonies of Cardinal Osius, Reszka believed that Poland was also the homeland of the mysterious pamphlet entitled *De tribus impostoribus*, a real incarnation of evil, where religion was said to be nothing but a lie.[72] On the same page of

69 The first time, Francken was accused of atheism by Fausto Sozzini in Francken 1656, *Disputatio*, p. 772: "Quotquot ego vidi adorationis Christis oppugnatores, omnes tandem in atheismum sunt prolapsi: quod et tibi accidet, nisi sententiam mutaverit" (also in Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 229, ll. 28–30).

70 This seems to be József Simon's opinion (Simon 2005, *Sed cur nihilo*; Simon 2013, *Metaphysical*, pp. 175–177).

71 Du Jon 1590, *Defensio*, A3r. See also: Ernst 1991, *Religione*, pp. 113–116.

72 Reszka 1596: *De Atheismis*, p. 421. On Stanisław Reszka, see: Spini 1978, *De Atheismis*.

De Atheismis, Reszka mentioned the thesis published by Francken in Krakow on the absurdities of the Catholic religion, wherein it was considered "rationi humanae communique sensui magis adversarium et contrarium."[73] He did not mention the title and distorted the name of its author,[74] but the book of which he was speaking was without doubt the *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum*, as shown by all other indications (among others, the reference to the abjuration in the church of Santa Barbara in Krakow, which he attended).[75] The idea of a Transylvanian or generally Germanic origin of *De tribus impostoribus*, and of materialistic and atheistic thought, could also be found in Tommaso Campanella,[76] who in some passages of his works associated this terrible book with information on the activity of Reszka, probably one of his main sources on the heresies of Central Europe.[77] Another source of Campanella was the voice of Francesco Pucci, who lived with him from March to May 1597 in the prison of the Holy Office in Rome.[78] Campanella told Doctor Guy Patin that he had seen a copy of *De tribus impostoribus* in the hands of Pucci;[79] however, the history of that mysterious book is a complicated matter, described as "un extraordinaire roman bibliographique."[80] The most interesting historical remark is that of Campanella, who, especially during the early years of the seventeenth century, wanted to combat a type of materialistic and anti-Christian thought that he referred to as "anticristianesimo macchiavellesco,"[81] which was not generically the theology of the masters of the Reformation. Campanella called that line of thought "atheism." Unlike Reszka, he did not intend to refer

73 Reszka 1596: *De Atheismis*, p. 421.

74 Reszka calls him "Gasparus Francken Saxo" (Reszka 1596: *De Atheismis*, p. 421). However, in another passage of the book, Reszka correctly mentions Christian Francken and recalls also Jakob Górski's confutation (Reszka 1596: *De Atheismis*, p. 26).

75 "Theses enim quasdam Cracoviae edidit, quarum haec erat summa: nihil esse, nec quicquam excogitari potuisse rationi humanae communique sensui magis adversarium et contrarium, quam id quod in universum docet fides Christiana, quam tamen blasphemiam apud patres Societatis Iesu in ecclesia Sanctae Barbarae, non ita multo post, me praesente, recantavit. Sed non ita multo post ad vomitum rediit" (Reszka 1596: *De Atheismis*, p. 421).

76 Campanella 1941, *Aforismi*, p. 119. See also: Ernst 1991, *Religione*, pp. 123–124.

77 See: Ernst 1991, *Religione*, pp. 123–129.

78 See *supra*, chapter 4.2, p. 85. See also: Campanella 1939, *Quod reminiscentur*, p. 144. See: Firpo 1949, *Processo*, p. 33.

79 See: Ernst 1991, *Religione*, pp. 129–130. On the relationship between Campanella and Pucci, see also: Ernst 2005, *Sicut amator*; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 81–85.

80 Rétat (ed.) 1973, *Traité*, p. 10.

81 The words are in the title of Campanella 2004, *L'ateismo*.

to every type of deviance, but rather a core of doctrines based on the idea of the political nature of religion, on the denial of natural religion, and on the notion of fraud perpetrated by the founding fathers of all religions to deceive their followers. The word "atheism" is not used here polemically, as it usually is in theological debates, with the aim of demonizing the adversaries, but refers to a rather defined thought. Campanella wrote the *Ateismo trionfato*, which many believe to be a reply to *De tribus impostoribus*, against this type of thought.[82] In the second chapter, Campanella numerates the main topics that atheists use to prove that Christianity is a lie "in questo secolo tenebroso, dove tutti paremo di un colore," some of which are very similar to Francken's. For example, after watching the clash of European factions and churches, Campanella inquires as to the principle of truth which can show "che sia vera la mia [theologia], e quella dell'altre nationi falsa."[83] The blood of the martyrs, the miracles, and hundreds of years of history are not enough to justify the authority of the Roman Church, since Jews, Muslims, and ancient pagans had the same evidence. Moreover, many dogmas are against reason: for example, that the body of Christ exists in so many hosts eaten by his followers, or that God is both a single entity and three people combined simultaneously, or that God condemns most men to eternal death. Those who believe in the Church of Rome also believe in these lies and cannot express their doubts without fear of being persecuted as heretics.

The only known copy of *De tribus impostoribus* is the one that was printed by Straube in Vienna in 1753 (yet dated 1598). We do not know whether the small book of Straube is the same as the one mentioned by Campanella; moreover, we are not sure if Campanella's book ever existed or if its history would have interlaced with that of the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae* of Francken. However, most of the ideas that many believed to be contained in that small book certainly were being spread during the sixteenth century on the fringes of theological controversies following the paths of radicalism in the debates on the philosophy of nature. Many topics in that mysterious book were more or less the same ones that Francken had discussed and used during his attempt to unmask religious falsehood. In some cases, Francken's topics were not entirely original; they came from other authors (Pomponazzi, Ficino, Simoni). However, the leading roles played by these topics in his thoughts and his methodical use of them make the similarities with the *De tribus* very interesting, in my opinion. I think that they

82 Beginning from: Le Mire 1649, *Bibliotheca*, p. 302.

83 Campanella 2004, *L'ateismo*, 1, p. 22.

strengthen the hypothesis that the ideas expressed in the pages of the book originated in the sixteenth century.

There are two hypotheses regarding the origins of *De tribus impostoribus*. The first is the thought of scholars who uphold the idea of a sixteenth-century origin of the first part of the book, following the theory of Wolfgang Gericke who published it in 1982.[84] The latter thought follows the edition published by Winfried Schröder in 1999. Schröder upholds that the whole work is the result of the debate that took place at the University of Kiel in April 1688, and attributes the book to the jurist of Hamburg Johann Joachim Müller.[85] The scholars who uphold the first hypothesis believe that the first seven chapters come from an original sixteenth century written work, which was perhaps modified throughout the years and later linked to a section written in the seventeenth century that begins in the eighth chapter with the words "ut constet." Sergio Landucci and Germana Ernst have recently emphasized the differences between the Latin in the first and second parts.[86] The first is characterized by an impersonal style and tone, poor vocabulary and an elementary syntax. The reasoning proceeds through the juxtapositioning of simple ideas, so that the text seems to be a mixture of different pieces or even a summary of more complex philosophical positions. Within the supposed sixteenth-century core, in my opinion, you can find another passage, which seems to connect different parts, strengthening the hypothesis of a composite and heterogeneous text. In the sixth chapter there is a discernible change in the line of reasoning. The key word "imposture" is used for the first time even though it is the foundation of the title's work. From the first to the fifth chapter the line of reasoning is similar to a dialogue reported indirectly by one narrator: on the one hand he enumerates evidence supporting God's existence, the necessity of religion and worship; on the other he proves their inconsistencies and emphasizes their superstitious, utilitarian, and absurd nature. Beginning in the sixth chapter, according to this evidential material and after finding the right word to define religion (i.e., "imposture"), he discusses how to neutralize or battle against it. In the first five chapters, the topics and the structure of argument are similar to Francken's in the *Disputatio*, where the word "imposture" (or its synonyms) actually never occurs.[87] The anonymous author of *De tribus impostoribus* wants

84 Gericke 1982, *Das Buch*.

85 Müller 1999, *De imposturis*.

86 Ernst 2006, *Un extraordinaire*, p. 18. Ernst adds that in the first part of the book "there are sixteenth-century echoes rather than similarities with the new philosophy" (p. 19).

87 See: Biagioni 2010, *Le origini*, p. 242. József Simon does not share this idea (Simon 2013, *Metaphysical*).

to prove that religion is only an *instrumentum regni*, i.e., a deception used to subdue simple people. The same idea, as we know, can be found in most of Francken's writings. *De tribus impostoribus* opens by claiming that every discussion on God and religion is founded on notions that we absolutely do not know. In fact, we do not know what God is; nevertheless, we speak of him. We accept *a priori* the idea that God's existence implies the necessity of venerating him with worship "ad mensuram cultus fastuosorum hominum."[88] A similar opinion on the irrationality of religious debates is expressed by the philosopher in his first reply in the *Disputatio*, when he rejects the idea of the divine inspiration of prophets because it is neither based on certitude nor used to clarify "ex notiori minus notum, sed ex prius credito posterius creditum."[89] Another analogy to the favorite topics of Christian Francken is the debate against religious cults, accused of being the same as kings and emperors. This topic can be found at the end of the second chapter of *De tribus impostoribus*,[90] and it is also discussed in *Breve colloquium Iesuiticum*, where honors paid to the pope and cardinals are equated to the ones bestowed on kings in other countries (especially in the Far East).[91] Francken also shows resemblances between the pope and the emperor of Japan, the supreme head of religion "qui paene pro numine colitur et vulgo sacrosanctus putatur sic ut prohibeatur humi vestigia ponere, latissimeque imperat et cum profanis regibus saepe certat."[92]

Religion is based only on possible reasons, since theology provides no absolute evidence as provided by mathematical and geometrical principles. In *De tribus impostoribus*, this idea is clearly couched: "non obstat quod, ut cognoscatur bis duo esse quatuor, opus haud sit omnes mathematicos congregare [...] cum e contrario religiones nec in fine, nec in principiis, nec in mediis concordant."[93] The same idea can be found in the prelude to *Disputatio*: "certa ratio est quae nec everti possit, et vel invitis extorquet consensum. Cuiusmodi est ista: si duae lineae inter se distantes aequaliter producantur, non possunt in unum punctum influere".[94] On the contrary, the truth of religion has

88 Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 32.

89 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 154.

90 "Simili modo uti Indi colligunt: Magnus Mogol est, ergo colendus est" (Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 40).

91 "Sic papa Romanus non solum episcopos tanquam principes haberet, sed cardinales etiam, purpureosve patres, qui summis regibus aequarentur, ex quibus solis instinctu Spiritus sancti vicarius Christi eligeretur" (Francken 1579, *Breve colloquium*, p. 29; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 174, ll. 30–33).

92 Francken 1579, *Breve colloquium*, pp. 20–21; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 171, ll. 16–18.

93 Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 64.

94 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 153.

no certainty "sive Turcica, sive Judaica, sive Christiana," since all religions are founded on possible reasons that can easily be denied by equally possible reasons, creating endless disagreements, even among Christians; what is undeniable for one is untrue for another. A similar relativistic idea of religious truth is in *De tribus impostoribus*: a Christian denies the validity of non-Christian religions as easily as others deny the validity of Christianity. Each defends his faith on the basis of divine revelations; none is irrefutable. The ancient world had laughed at its oracles; the writings of Moses are opposed by the Koran, which is opposed by the sacred texts of Veda, and so on.[95] It is impossible to tell who is right, because without a reliable criterion of truth, no religion can claim to be the real one. Religions do not provide knowledge; they are only political instruments. Francken set out to prove just that in the *Disputatio*. He used the voice of the philosopher to illustrate the attempts of false prophets, as well as those of statesmen, to deceive the faithful, or their subjects, since "cum incertum est antecedens, quam nihil prohibet homines fingere se commercium habere cum Deo et audire sermonem illius."[96] Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and many other non-Christians had pretended to have spoken with gods and to have received laws from them, and had then proceeded to use this supposed privilege to exercise power over the people. Zoroaster, Lycurgus, Solon, Minos, Numa Pompilius, Muhammad, and Pythagoras, who convinced people that he had spent a year in the underworld, did the same. The comparison between the divine revelations of Moses and those of the nymph Egeria to Numa Pompilius is also in *De tribus impostoribus*, and for the same purpose.[97] Princes, priests, and statesmen pretended to have a special relationship with the gods so that people would fear their power. The anonymous author of the *De tribus impostoribus* claims that the main cause of the veneration of the gods is fear. Indians, for example, venerate the Great Mogul "potissimum ob metum potentiae visibilis," but since the invisible powers are even more ominous than visible ones, all divinities, and God himself, are the most venerated.[98] Christians claim that God must be venerated for his love, yet represent him as a tyrant who condemns masses of innocent men because of Adam's error. The topic of God as a tyrant was used not only by Francken,[99] but also by many other radical reformers in their controversies against the dogma of predestination in the

95 Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 54.

96 Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, p. 155.

97 Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, pp. 50, 56.

98 Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 40.

99 For example, in Francken 1584, *Praecipuarum enumeratio*, 3r (now in Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 244, ll. 2–6).

second half of the century. More interesting is the idea that fear is the foundation of religion. This opinion is expressed in *Spectrum diurnum genii Christiani Francken*, a handwritten work composed around 1588.[100] Francken takes such an idea from the *Adversus mathematicos*, where Sextus Empiricus mentions a passage of Critias of Athens in which he argues that only laws raised men from the state of nature. A wise man found it necessary to instill fear to ensure that those laws would be respected and that nobody would do, say, or even think something evil with impunity. Critias concludes "hinc Deum introduxit," who could hear every word of man, see his single acts, and read his wicked thoughts.[101]

In the first chapter of *De tribus impostoribus* there is a reflection upon the doctrine of the generation of the Son "ab infinito" that comes from the Anti-trinitarian thought of the sixteenth century. The anonymous author writes that this topic was conceived because placing the generation during the time of the Son and of the Holy Spirit would imply a beginning and hence a development or a transformation of God, who, by definition, must be eternal and unchangeable.[102] Similar topics are to be found in Francken. In the *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum*, for example, he emphasizes how much the idea of a supposed generation of the Son in time is inconsistent with divine perfection, since God "qui genuit, necessario desiit eundem filium generare mutatusque est a generando ad non generandum."[103] What is eternal has always been and always will be, and what always is cannot have been generated. Neither does the dogma of transubstantiation stand up to rational examination. Francken proves its absurdity in *De bestialissima idololatria*, where he derides the idea that the body of Christ, with all his limbs, can be confined to a small host and then eaten by believers.[104] This is only

100 "Huiusmodi autem Deum metuendum sola facit religio, cuius et nomen et omen tractum est a metu. Unde sepulcra et iura religiosa dicebantur, quia metus erat ea violare, et veteres valde anxii erant in ceremoniis suis, timentes magnum aliquod malum, si in iis secus aliquid aut dictum aut factum esset, quam praescriptum erat" (Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 195–196).

101 Sextus Empiricus 1569, *Adversus mathematicos*, p. 264.

102 "Ab infinito enim generatur Filius: ab infinito spiratur Spiritus Sanctus. In infinitum generatur, proceditur. Si enim coepissent, aut si desinerent semel generatio ista, spiratio, aeternitatis conceptus violaretur" (Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 34).

103 Francken 1584, *Praecipuarum enumeratio*, A4r; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 247, ll. 32–33.

104 "Parva, inquiunt, hostia est, atqui magnus et triginta trium annorum Christus. Neque enim minus corpus ullo modo circumplecti maius et omni ex parte continere potest. Vel si cum tota ibi sua est quantitate seu magnitudine Christus, quomodo in tam parvam ostia includitur, et inclusus non comprimitur, compressus autem non membris omnibus

one of several blasphemies that Christians accept even though they are paradoxical. In *De tribus impostoribus* the topic is used as proof that all religions are equally irrational.[105] Religious thought, in fact, is based on human experiences that are projected onto the sphere of the supernatural, which man can neither imagine nor think of. In the *De tribus impostoribus*, the idea that religion is the result of human imagination looking for answers to problems and phenomena which reason is not able to explain, is often found. It is the projection of human hopes and fears. Francken does not seem to be very far from these positions in his *Analysis rixae Christianae*, where he claims that the human mind cannot think of anything immaterial except through "phantasmata" that are, as we have seen, projections of the physical world into the imaginary world that we believe to be the divine reality.[106]

How far does Francken approach an atheistic solution? How much of his methodical use of doubt about theological problems (and especially about the existence of God and the essence of religion) was really corrosive?[107] In the theological controversies of the sixteenth century, the word "atheism" was usually used in order to discredit the thought of adversaries. This word did not have a rational dignity, but was a terrible and indefinite accusation. Together with many other similar words (Epicureanism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and so on), it came from the revival, often unlikely, of ancient heresies that filled the papers of the controversialists of all Churches. In such a way Catholics, Calvinists, and Lutherans tried to stem religious deviances or battle against each other. The word "atheism" retained the same meaning and was used for polemical purposes among radical reformers too: Fausto Sozzini accused Francken of atheism, Pucci accused Fausto Sozzini of Epicureanism, the adversaries accused Pucci of Pelagianism, and Calvin accused Servetus of being the son of Satan himself. Francken used "atheism" only once in his defence against Sozzini's attack.[108] The word never occurs in his other works, perhaps not by chance. In fact, especially in the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, the possibility of questioning the truth of religion and the existence of a transcendent God is a rationally sustainable thesis. It is the inevitable result of the critical attitude that

---

confunditur, planeque emoritur?" (Francken 1580, *De bestialissima*, pp. 77–78; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 187, ll. 24–29).

105 Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, p. 66.

106 Francken 1595, *Analysis*, A2v; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 287, ll. 24–26.

107 I discussed these topics with József Simon: Simon (2013): *Metaphysical certitude*; Biagioni (2013): *Christian Francken*.

108 Francken 1565, *Disputatio*, p. 773; Francken 2014, *Opere*, p. 230, l. 4.

is essential to eliminate superstition and idolatry. "Atheism," therefore, is not a polemical word, and can therefore not be used to attack adversaries. I think that the historical significance of the experience of Christian Francken really becomes more interesting from this perspective, and easier to understand. Even though—or perhaps because of—the word "atheism" almost never recurs in his writings, the awareness of such a problem makes it a prospect as much inevitable as it is disturbing. It sometimes seems to be the logical conclusion of his reasoning, even if he never goes to the end. But life choices are not always consequences of rational necessities. Often, they are caused by fear or uncertainty. This is also demonstrated by the effects that the possible outcomes of Francken's thought had on his conscience, which was not able to support such radical truths: in his day the defence of atheism was the cause of loneliness, marginalization, and suffering.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

6.1 The Radical Reformation and the Making of Modern Europe

A few months after the burning of Michael Servetus, John Calvin published the *Defensio orthodoxae fidei* (January 1554) in Geneva. In it he defended himself from his opponents' attacks, arguing that obstinate heretics must be executed. He cited Old Testament sources (especially Deut. XIII), equating heretics with false prophets and judging them worthy of death: "ubi palam defectio ab unico Deo puraque eius doctrina tentatur, ad extremum illud remedium [capitale supplicium] descendere necesse est, ne mortale venenum longius serpat."[1] In the *Defensio* he expresses the opinion that defending "Gloria Dei" is a Christian's fundamental duty. In the same year, Sebastian Castellio, the most prominent figure among the group of religious dissidents who had gathered in Basel, wrote *Contra libellum Calvini*, a work written in response to Calvin's, that was published posthumously in 1612. Castellio strongly attacks Calvin's arguments, defending the inviolability of the individual with these famous words: "Hominem occidere, non est doctrinam tueri, sed est hominem occidere."[2] Today, historians debate the complex intellectual relationship between Calvin and Castellio. Certainly, it cannot be reduced to a superficial dichotomy pitting a champion of toleration against a persecutor.[3] Academic discussions aside, however, there can be no doubt as to which of their assertions is more in keeping with the values of modern western civilization, even if Calvin was the founder of a still-operating Church, while Castellio is today known only to scholars.

The Reformation was not only simply a movement that created new churches, it was also—primarily, perhaps—an extraordinary laboratory of ideas, one that made fundamental contributions to the rise of modern Europe. From this perspective, the Radical Reformation can be seen as having played a pivotal role; it influenced the intellectual process that led to the Cultural Revolution in eighteenth-century Europe. In my opinion, the Radical Reformation was not merely a subplot of heretical history within the larger

1 Calvin 1870, *Defensio*, col. 477.

2 Castellio 1612, *Contra libellum*, E1v.

3 Salvadori 2010, *Il martire e l'eretico*.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004335783_007

narrative of the Magisterial Reformation.[4] Radical reformers retained the great expectations and revolutionary ideas of the early masters of the Reformation—Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin—and in many cases carried their criticisms of traditional doctrines and authorities to extremes (e.g., the Trinitarian dogma or Predestination). Radical reformers continued their search for religious truth without compromise, even at the cost of marginalization and seclusion. Historians have tended to view them—with the exceptions of Socinians and Anabaptists—as totally isolated figures. This view has been reinforced by the characterization of radical reformers as "heretics," i.e., those who chose to exclude themselves from orthodoxy. To the contrary, I believe they seldom acted alone. The close relationships between them, the sharing of some basic ideas, and common features in their attitudes, allow historians to regard the Radical Reformation as a European phenomenon. George H. Williams showed that dissidents in Switzerland, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, England, Germany, France, Poland, Moravia, and Transylvania were in contact with one another.[5] I focused my research mainly on Italian and German exiles, but radical reformers came from many other countries and traveled all over Europe, hoping for the same great renewal.

In the sixteenth century theological concepts were often used as tools for interpretation of reality *tout court*; theological language was so widespread that the notion of "regnum Dei" corresponded to that of civil society. Basic principles of modern western civilization, democratic and secularized, were advanced and discussed in the context of theological thought, not in opposition to it. Even the reasonableness and the intellectual dignity of atheism—qualities acknowledged by both believers and non-believers today—are outcomes of the criticism to which some radical reformers subjected the cultural certainties of their time. The main aim of their struggles was to defend religious freedom, primarily the freedom to exercise individual reason against the authority of institutional churches. Many of them fought against irrational superstitions and dogmas because they believed the human mind has the capacity—and therefore the obligation—to criticize all claims of truth that are based solely on the principle of authority. In their opinion, the weight of tradition was less important than the light of reason. They often used the Erasmian distinction between *adiafora* and *fundamentalia fidei*—between a few dogmas considered necessary to final salvation, and many others about which we can wait and see—and they sifted through each article of faith in an attempt to remove all that was not *supra* reason, but *contra* reason. Of course, this belief

4 See *supra*, chapter 1.

5 Williams 1962, *The Radical Reformation*.

added to the problem of toleration, the right to dissent, and the opportunity for different religious ideas to experience peaceful coexistence within the same country. Though the birth of toleration as a philosophical and political concept is commonly dated to John Locke's *A letter concerning toleration* (1689), there can be no doubt that its origins lie in the theological debates of the sixteenth century. The word "toleration" rarely appeared in the sixteenth century,[6] but the concept was clearly present in some of Castellio's works—especially the famous *De haereticis an sint persequendi* (1554) and later the *Conseil á la France désolée* (1562)—as well as those of others reformers. Secularism, toleration, and rationalism—three basic principles of modern western civilization—are part of the cultural heritage of the Radical Reformation.

6.2 Secularism

Roland H. Bainton wrote: "The Age of the Enlightenment raised few monuments to forgotten precursors but stood nonetheless in their debt."[7] One of these debts was the challenge to the temporal power of the Roman Church. In *De libertate Christiana* (1520), Luther expressed the firm belief that each Christian is, within his own consciousness, beyond the authority of the pope or any other temporal authority. His words were received as a message of liberation from the burden of rules and ecclesiastical hierarchies. Radical reformers took these words literally and preserved their revolutionary force when, in subsequent years, Lutheranism became another church with new rules and new duties. One of the consequences of the doctrine of Christian freedom was that many radical reformers were not churchmen. They belonged to so-called civil society: Francesco Pucci was a young business man, Fausto Sozzini was a diplomat, Giorgio Biandrata and Giovanni Paolo Alciati were doctors, Matteo Gribaldi was a jurist, and Celio Secondo Curione and Valentino Gentile were humanists. Some were churchmen (Bernardino Ochino and Christian Francken), but they left their religious orders to be able to freely debate their ideas. In the sixteenth century, the theological debate took place outside the churches. This was made possible by the printing press, which made texts that had once been the exclusive property of abbeys, monasteries, and universities more widely available. People talked about theology at home, in the squares and in the printing houses. When Francesco Pucci published his

6 Rotondò 1992, *Europe et Pays-Bas*, pp. 15–20.

7 Bainton 1963, *The Reformation*, p. 140, at the end of the chapter on the "Free spirits" of the Reformation.

Thesis (January 1578) to debate the theory of the universal salvation of mankind, he addressed himself not to churchmen and professors, but "omnibus veritatis studiosis," wherever they were and whatever their position. Similarly, the debate in Basel between Pucci and Sozzini "de statu primi hominis ante lapsum" did not take place in a university classroom, but most likely at the home of Francesco Betti, their mutual friend, and in the printing house of Pietro Perna. The radical reformers who left their countries and walked across Europe were sure that religious truth could be found beyond churches, within their own consciences.[8] The doctrine that the Roman Church must have a temporal power as a consequence of the power of Christ the King came from the thought of Ambrose, and was widespread in the Middle Ages. This idea implied that the Roman Church exercised its power in connection with or in competition with the power of the king. Consequently, the Church had to be strongly institutionalized and organically rooted in a country.[9] The radical reformers cut this link. The Anabaptist communities were examples of groups of true believers separated from the state and from civil society. Only the coming of Christ *Pantocrator* at the end of time would see the establishment of a new power in the world. Until then, it was right that doubt existed among believers, and no authority could dispel it or impose its doctrine by force, as Castellio wrote in *De arte dubitandi*. The individual search for truth, generally regarded as the way to sin, became a privileged tool of knowledge, and the gift of prophecy was used to argue in defence of freedom of thought. Prophecy did not necessarily imply supernatural visions; it meant freedom of expression, such as had existed in ancient Christian communities.[10] Without the free exchange of ideas, the spirit of God could not reveal itself to man.

The radical reformers did not imagine the universal Church as a visible institution, but as an invisible spiritual reality not necessarily united in space, a circumstance that would prevail only at the end of time and outside of history: "collegi d'uomini, i quali vivono forestieri per gli altrui paesi, o come forastieri in casa loro."[11] During the course of history, the principle of truth

8 See chapter 2.

9 See: Pesce 2015, *Il conflitto dei simboli*. On the political Christology of Ambrose see: Lettieri 2013, *Omnipotentia e subiectio*.

10 "Ma per istruire bene et presto il popolo raccomandarono sopra tutto la profetia (*1 Cor* 14), ch'era uno ordine di discorrere e ragionare, con somma semplicità et lealtà, delle cose sacre e spirituali" (Pucci 1580, *Informatione*, p. 142; Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, pp. 119–120).

11 *Forma d'una republica Catholica* in Firpo 1957, *Gli scritti*, p. 265. See *supra*, chapter 2, pp. 53–56.

could reside not in a hierarchical authority, but in the reason of individual believers. This firm belief was the main cause of what Richard Popkin called "the intellectual crisis of the Reformation,"[12] and the origin of modern relativism. Illustrating this is Christian Francken's attempt to liberate religion from superstition, which ended in a dramatic conclusion: one must deny every certainty about the foundations of faith, of knowledge, and of God's existence.[13] Francken's uncompromising search for the truth had serious consequences: he recanted his confession of faith over and over again, and was so disturbed by his own conclusions that he even tried to kill himself. Nevertheless, perhaps unintentionally, he raised the issue of the acceptability of atheism and of its intellectual dignity, unthinkable at the time, yet now commonly admitted. This achievement may seem less remarkable than the Scientific Revolution or the cultural consequences of geographical discoveries; however, it was of equal importance to the creation of the modern European identity.

6.3 Toleration and Rationalism

The history of toleration in the 16th and 17th centuries is the history of a problem and the debate that developed around it.[14] In the Age of the Reformation, dissidents and members of religious minorities dealt with the problem more directly. This occurred for two main reasons: the first was the need to defend themselves against the institutional churches and the civil authorities who attempted to delegitimize and punish them for exercising freedom of thought, sometimes with warnings, sometimes by force. The second was their new conception of the Church: for Magisterial reformers, an institutional Church, linked to a territory, and for Radical reformers, a free and spiritual Church, embracing all mankind. In the beginning, the debate on toleration was not only about the problem of peaceful coexistence among churches and of the relationship between Christians and the state. It pitted two conflicting notions of the Church, two different ideas of civil society, against one another. This question had already been addressed in *De amplitudine beati regni Dei* (1554) by Celio Secondo Curione, published in Basel soon after the burning of Servetus. Against Calvin's intolerance, Curione had offered an extremely broad conception of God's kingdom, one that included the ancients and the savages of the newly discovered lands. In *De amplitudine*, the word "toleration" appears

12 Popkin 2003, *The History*, pp. 4–5. See *supra*, chapter 5, p. 108.

13 See *supra*, chapter 5.

14 Rotondò 1992, *Europe et Pays-Bas*, p. 19.

only once, with the common meaning "endure patiently." However, he linked the necessity of defending religious freedom with a new and extremely open conception of church and of civil society. In the second half of the sixteenth century, universalism—the theory of the salvation of all mankind, including those outside the visible churches—increasingly became a prerequisite for toleration, as opposed to the sacramentalism of the Roman Church and the double predestination of Calvinism. As we know, the widest universalism was defended by the Florentine exile Francesco Pucci, who ascribed absolute efficaciousness to natural religion in terms of salvation. He claimed that God reveals himself to every man through the light of "natural reason," showing him the way to the kingdom of heaven.[15] This idea was considered so radical that it came to be perceived as the source of a new current of thought, "Puccianism," a concept used to demonize every type of naturalism.[16] In the following century, its polemical target was Spinozism (the identification of God and nature), in all of the various facets that it had assumed in the theological and philosophical debate. The theological universalism of the sixteenth century had something in common with the Enlightenment of the seventeenth century, especially the Radical Enlightenment. Its aim was not to change a particular institution, or convert a particular country. Its horizon was above all nations: for the former, the kingdom of God—that is, civil society; for the latter, human reason, which guides all mankind. The belief that there are universal and natural rights on which to build civil society—an idea often supported in light of the eighteenth-century anti-libertine dispute—[17] would be very difficult to understand without the Radical Reformation: a text like the *Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar* in *Emile* by Rousseau would appear rootless. You could say the same for some of the ideas of Spinoza who, as Israel wrote: "continually adduces the 'state of nature' as a measuring-road for assessing political and moral phenomena, and identifying what is best and most essential in human existence. Hence, democracy is declared better than monarchy and aristocracy because it is the 'most natural form of the state, approaching most closely that freedom which Nature grants to every man'."[18]

Universalism also exerted an influence on the Socinian movement in the seventeenth century, providing arguments in support of human dignity in the state of nature, and consequently the salvation of mankind, even for those without knowledge of the Holy Scriptures or who live outside the visible

15 Biagioni 2011, *Francesco Pucci*, p. 91.

16 See *supra*, chapter 4.

17 See: Landucci 2014, *I filosofi*, pp. 59–100.

18 Israel 2002, *The Radical Enlightenment*, p. 271.

churches. The notion of natural religion appeared in *De Deo et eius attributis* (1630) by Johann Crell—though Fausto Sozzini had rejected it—and through Crell it had some influence on the thought of John Locke, as we have seen.[19] This is only one example of the complex development of the Socinian tradition when it came into contact with the great political and philosophical debates that shaped European culture in the seventeenth century. In fact, Fausto Sozzini had tried to rationalize Christian theology, denying everything that was against rational evidence, such as the Trinity and the metaphysical significance of Adam's fall: Christ was not the second person of the Trinity, and Adam's fall was simply the first sin of human history. The expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden had caused a loss of privilege, but it had not changed their nature. Man's mind was not clouded, becoming exclusively a source of errors; on the contrary, it remained the only tool he had with which to understand the word of God, correctly interpret the Holy Scriptures and imitate Christ's example. There is no one original sin that weighs upon men from birth; consequently there was no need of Christ's sacrifice to expiate it.

A radical outcome of Socinian rationalism was the sensistic materialism of Christian Francken. He argued that nothing could be thought if it did not come from the senses. Every type of nativism was unimaginable. Francken had already rejected the argument of "consensum gentium" in the *Colloquium Iesuiticum* (1579), claiming that the similarities between the rites of the Jesuits and the religious customs of the Japanese—which he knew of thanks to reports from the Jesuit missionaries in the Far East—were not evidence of the innate idea of God. In his opinion they proved the earthly origin of both. He later adopted more skeptical and relativistic positions, and became convinced that no religion could accuse another of being in error because it would be impossible to prove in the absence of an unquestioned criterion of truth. In the *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae* (1593) he wrote: "quod secundum legem vestram turpe est, non est turpe secundum aliam, nec est necesse, ut sit turpe vel falsum secundum naturam. Neque enim habetis certam rationem, qua id possitis ostendere."[20] In this way he opened the doors to libertine relativism. More than a hundred years later, after having enumerated the different customs of various peoples of the world, François de La Mothe le Vayer wrote these words: « il n'y a folie, pourveu qu'elle soit bien suivie, qui ne passe pour sagesse; il n'y a vertu, qui ne soit prise pour un vice, ni vice qui ne tienne lieu de vertu. »[21] He wanted to emphasize extreme cultural

19 See *supra*, chapter 3.

20 Francken 2008, *Disputatio*, p. 160.

21 La Mothe le Vayer 1716, *Dialogue*, p. 42.

diversity, and the weakness of the law of nature argument.[22] The eighteenth century debate on the law of nature had deep roots going back to the theological controversies stirred up by radical reformers two centuries earlier.

The contribution of Socinian thought to the rise of modern philosophical reason has yet to be thoroughly studied. However, there can be no doubt as to its importance. The banishment of the Socinians from Poland in 1658 obliged them to migrate to Western Europe, mostly to the Netherlands and England, fostering the diffusion of their thought. Inevitably it underwent so many transformations that Pierre Bayle, in the entry on "Spinoza" in his *Dictionnaire*, wrote: "en France on appelle Sociniens tout ceux qui passent pour incrédules sur les mystéres de l'Evangile, quoi que la plupart de ces gens-là n'ajent jàmais lu ni Socin, ni ses Disciples."[23] Socinianism played an important role in discussions about the thought of Spinoza: the first refutation of *Ethica* was by Socinian Noël Aubert de Versé.[24] The same holds true for Cartesianism: one of the most considerable commentaries on Descartes' *Meditationes Metaphysicae* was the *Annotationes* by the noble Socinian Johann Ludwig Wolzogen.[25] Socinian tradition also had an influence on the thought of the scientific revolution—Isaac Newton was deeply influenced by it—but it was really decisive on the topic of toleration, one of the great concepts that helped shape the Europe that we know today.

6.4 The Break of Modernity

In contemporary historiographical debate, the idea of a long Middle Age lasting until the Industrial Revolution in the nineteenth century, has come to the fore.[26] Such a model downplays the innovative power of the Modern Age, emphasizing the long duration of economic structures rather than the novelty of ideas. The present volume suggests an interpretation of the Radical Reformation based on the opposite idea: i.e., that modernity's break with tradition was not primarily in the economic field, but in the cultural one. And it was an irreversible change. One of my aims has been to demonstrate that the Early Modern Age initiated "a revolution of the mind,"[27] one that played

22 Landucci 2014, *I filosofi*, pp. 72–75.

23 Bayle 1820, *Dictionnaire*, t. XIII, pp. 418–419.

24 Now see: Aubert de Versé 2015, *L'impie*.

25 Now see: Wolzogen 2012, *Annotationes*.

26 Le Goff 2004, *Un long*.

27 As we know, the expression is by Israel 2010, *A revolution*.

a defining role in the history of European thought and consequently in the history of social and political relationships. This revolution reached its zenith with the Enlightenment; that would not have been possible, however, without the contribution of certain ideas from the Radical Reformation. At the beginning, the making of Modernity in Europe was characterized by the loss of old certainties and by the decline of traditional authorities. The radical reformers played a key role in this cultural crisis. Many of them perceived the importance of their battle, despite the effort to marginalize them, mounted by the society of the time. Most radical reformers were regarded as fanatics—Luther used the word "schwärmer"—and even today they are often thought of as deluded visionaries. There is something true in this, but only because they were ahead of their times. They sought toleration, freedom of thought, and respect for the dignity of individual reason, even when confronted with force by the authorities. To us, these are all inalienable rights. In July 1579 Francesco Pucci wrote a letter from London to his family in Florence. Seven years earlier, he had left the family business to study the Holy Scriptures, first in Paris, then in England. His father had never approved of this choice: he had imagined a bright future for his son, hoping that one day he would become a lawyer or a business man, and that he would take care of the household. Now he felt betrayed and tired. Francesco, however, was sure he had made the right choice and asked his mother to persuade his father of this: "I thank my father very much. I hope that he remembers me in his prayers, as I do with him. God suddenly makes a light shine where the dark is deepest: I hope He will make my father understand that I have not wasted my money or my days, since I have devoted myself to the things of greatest importance for this and the next life."[28]

28 Pucci 1955–59, *Lettere*, I, p. 56. Translation is mine.

Bibliography

Published Primary Sources

Agrippa von Nettesheim, Heinrich Cornelius (1531): *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum et artium, atque excellentia verbi Dei, declamatio*, Paris: Johannes Petrus.

Andreasi, Marsilio (1542): *Trattato divoto et utilissimo della divina misericordia raccolto da diverse autorità delle scritture sacre et da altri trattati d'alcuni catholici dottori di latino in volgare*, Brescia: per Ludovico Britannico.

Andreasi, Marsilio (1550): *De amplitudine misericordiae Dei absolutissima oratio, a Marsilio Andreasio Mantuano Italico sermone primum conscripta, nunc in latinum conversa Caelio Horatio Curione interprete*, Basileae: Oporinus.

Anonymous (2006): *I tre impostori. Mosè, Gesù, Maometto*, ed. by Germana Ernst, Calabritto (AV): Mattia & Fortunato Editori.

Arnold, Gottfried (1740): *Unpartheyische Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, vom Anfang des Neuen Testaments bis aus das Jahr Christi 1688*, Schaffausen: Emanuel and Benedict Hurter.

Aubert de Versé, Noël (2015): *L'impie convaincu, ou dissertation contre Spinoza*, ed. by Fiormichele Benigni, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Baillet, Adrien (1725): *Jugemens des savans sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs, revûs, corrigez et augmentez par mr. de la Monnoye, nouvelle edition*, tome sixieme, Amsterdam: aux depens de la Compagnie.

Barclay, Robert (1676): *Theologiae verae Christianae Apologia*, Amsterdam: Clark.

Bargagli, Girolamo (1982): *Dialogo de' giuochi che nelle vegghie sanesi si usano di fare*, ed. by Patrizia D'Incalci Ermini, with an introduction of Roberto Bruscagli, Siena: Accademia Senese degli Intronati.

Battiferri, Laura (1560): *Il primo libro dell'opere Toscane*, Firenze: Giunti.

Bayle, Pierre (1740): *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, cinquieme edition, Amsterdam: Brunel.

Bayle, Pierre (1820): *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, Paris: Desoer.

Becmann, Johann Christoph (ed.) (1706): *Catalogus Bibliothecae publicae Universitatis Francofurtanae*, Francofurti ad Viadrum: Schrey & Hartmann.

Bèze, Théodore de (1588): *Ad Acta Colloquii Montisbelgardensis Tubingae edita Responsionis pars altera*, Genevae: Ioannes Le Preux.

Bèze, Théodore de (1968): *Correspondence. Tome* V (*1564*), ed. by H. Aubert, A. Dufour, A. Henseler, H. Meylan, Genève: Librairie Droz.

Bèze, Théodore de (2012): *Correspondence. Tome* XXXVI (*1595*), ed. by H. Aubert, M. Cuany, A. Dufour, H. Genton, B. Nicollier-De Weck, Genève: Librairie Droz.

Bock, Friedrich Samuel (1774): *Historia antitrinitariorum maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum*, 2 vols., Regiomonti et Lipsiae: Hartung.

Bruno, Giordano (1889): *Articuli centum et sexaginta adversus huius tempestatis mathematicos atque philosophos*, in Bruno 1889, *Opera*, vol. I, pars III, pp. 1–118.

Bruno, Giordano (1889): *Opera latine conscripta publicis sumptibus edita*, ed. by Felice Tocco and Girolamo Vitelli, Florence: typis successorum Le Monnier.

Bruno, Giordano (2007): *Opere italiane*, ed. by Giovanni Aquilecchia, Nuccio Ordine, 2 vols., Torino: Utet.

Bruno Giordano, Campanella Tommaso (1956): *Opere di Giordano Bruno e di Tommaso Campanella*, ed. by Augusto Guzzo and Romano Amerio, Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi.

Calovius, Abraham (1655–1677): *Systema locorum theologicorum e sacra potissimum Scriptura et antiquitate necnon adversariorum confessione*, Vitebergae: sumptibus A. Hartmanni.

Calvin, John (1667): *Brevis refutatio errorum et impietatum Michaelis Serveti*, in Calvin 1667, *Tractatus*, pp. 528–597.

Calvin, John (1667): *Tractatus theologici omnes in unum volume certis classibus congesti*, Amsterdam: apud Joannem Iacobi Schipper.

Calvin, John (1863–1873): *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. by Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, Eduardus Reuss, Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke et filium.

Calvin, John (1870): *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra Trinitate, contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani*, in Calvin 1863–1873, *Opera*, VIII, cols. 457–644.

Calvin, John (1870): *Impietas Valentini Gentilis detecta et palam traducta*, in Calvin 1863–1873, *Opera*, IX, cols. 365–420.

Calvin, John (1870): *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*, in Calvin 1863–1873, *Opera*, VIII, cols. 253–366.

Campanella, Tommaso (1939): *Quod reminiscentur et convertentur ad dominum universi fines terrae*, ed. by Romano Amerio, Padova: Cedam.

Campanella, Tommaso (1941): *Aforismi politici*, ed. by Luigi Firpo, Torino: Giappichelli.

Campanella, Tommaso (2004): *L'ateismo trionfato ovvero riconoscimento filosofico della religione universale contra l'antichristianesimo macchiavellesco*, ed. by Germana Ernst, 2 vols., Pisa: Edizioni della Normale.

Castellio, Sebastian (1612): *Contra libellum Calvini in quo ostendere conatur haereticos jure gladii coercendos esse*, Amsterdam.

Castellio, Sebastian (1981): *De arte dubitandi et confidendi, ignorandi et sciendi*, ed. by Elisabeth Feist Hirsch, Leiden: Brill.

Castellio, Sebastian (1997): *La persecuzione degli eretici*, ed. by Stefano Visentin, Torino: La Rosa Editrice.

Chauvin, Pierre (1693): *De Naturali Religione liber in tres partes divisus*, Roterodami: apud Petrus van der Slaat.

Clifford, Martin (1682): *Traité de la raison humaine, traduit de l'Anglois et augmenté d'une Préface qui contient plusieurs authoritez justificatives des sentimens de l'autheur*, Amsterdam: Jochem van Dyck.

Clifford, Martin (1736): *A treatise of human reason*, the third edition, London: printed for J. Roberts and J. Stone.

Colberg, Ehregott Daniel (1710): *Das Platonisch-Hermetisches Christenthums, Begreiffend die Historische Erzehlung vom Ursprung und Vielerley Secten der heutigen Fanatischen Theologie, unterm Namen der Paracelsisten, Weigelianer, Rosencreutzer, Quäcker, Böhmisten, Wiedertäuffer, Bourignisten, Labadisten, und Quietisten*, Ander Theil, Leipzig: Iohann Ludwig Gleditsch und Georg Weidmanns.

Crell, Johannes (1630): *De Deo et eius attributis*, in Völkel 1630, *De vera religione*, pp. 1–352.

Crell, Samuel (1700): *Cogitationum novarum de primo et secundo Adamo, sive de ratione salutis per illum amissae per hunc recuperatae compendium*, Amstelaedami: apud Irenaeum Aspidium.

Curcellaeus, Stephanus (1675): *Opera teologica, quorum pars praecipua Institutio Religionis Christianae*, Amstelodami: apud Danielem Elsevirum.

Curione, Celio Secondo (1554): *De amplitudine beati regni Dei dialogi sive libri duo*, Poschiavo-Basel: Landolfi-Oporino.

De Gaspari, Giovanni Battista (1776): *Commentarius de vita, fatis, operibus et opinionibus Francisci Puccii Filidini*, in "Nuova raccolta d'opuscoli scientifici e filosofici," xxx, pp. 1–50, Venezia: Occhi.

Donne, John (1990): *The Major Works*, ed. by John Carey, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dudith, András (1992–): *Epistulae*, eds. Lech Szczucki and Tibor Szepessy, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Du Jon (Junius), Franciscus (1590): *Defensio Catholicae doctrinae de sancta Trinitate personarum in unitate essentiae Dei, adversus Samosatenicos errores specie inanis philosophiae in Polonia exundantes et libello comprehensos cuius haec inscriptio: Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum cur Christiani, cum in multis religionis doctrinis mobiles sint et varii, in Trinitatis tamen retinendo dogmate sint constantissimi*, Heidelbergae: [Commelinus].

Du Jon (Junius), Franciscus (1592): *Catholicae doctrinae de natura hominis iacentis in peccato et gratia Dei ex peccato evocantis omnes communiter* [...] *Collatio cum doctrina nova libelli recens admodum editi cuius inscriptio De Christi servatoris efficacitate*, Lugduni Batavorum: ex Officina Plantiniana.

Erasmus, Desiderius Roterodamus (1524): *De immensa Dei misericordia* [...] *Concio*, Basileae: apud Ioannem Frobenium.

Erasmus, Desiderius Roterodamus (2002): *Antibarbari*, ed. by Luca D'Ascia, Torino: Aragno Editore.

Ferentilli, Agostino (ed.) (1571): *Primo volume della scielta di stanze di diversi autori toscani*, Venetia: ad instantia de' Giunti di Firenze.

Francken, Christian (1579): *Breve colloquium Iesuiticum, toti orbi Christiano et urbi potissimum Cesareae Viennensi, ad recte cognoscendam, hactenus non satis perspectam, Iesuitarum religionem utilissimum, habitum a sacrae theologiae doctore et professore Paulo Florenio cum Christiano Francken philosophiae professore in Caesareo Iesuitarum Gymnasio*, Lipsiae: Ioannes Steinman.

Francken, Christian (1580): *De bestialissima idololatria, quam in adorazione panis et vini renovat Societas, Iesu divino sub cognomento latitans secunda bestia, paradoxa sex*, Basileae: [Perna].

Francken, Christian (1580): *De praedestinatione mira paradoxa tria*, Basileae: [Perna].

Francken, Christian (1582): *Epistola Christiani Francken, in qua deplorat suum a Societate Iesu et Ecclesia Catholica discessum, eiusque fidem ac religionem a se temere oppugnatam*, Viennae: Leonhardus Nassingerus.

Francken, Christian (1584): *Epistola Nicolai Regii Germani, in qua cuidam amico respondet ad Christophori Varsevicii orationes nuper editas et sibi missas*, in Varsevicius 1584, *Apologia*, A2r–B2v.

Francken, Christian (1584): *Praecipuarum enumeratio causarum, cur Christiani, cum in multis religionis doctrinis mobiles sint et varii, in Trinitatis tamen retinendo dogmate sint constantissimi*, Cracoviae: Aleksy Rodecki.

Francken, Christian (1589): *Mirabilium visionum, revelationum, illustrationum Ignatii Loiolae, Societatis Iesu auctoris, admiratio Christiana Christopori Severi ad reverendos dominos Iesitas ubivis terrarum existentes*, Witebergae: ex officina haeredum Cratonis.

Francken, Christian (1595): *Analysis rixae Christianae quae imperium turbat et diminuit Romanum*, Pragae: ex officina Schumaniana.

Francken, Christian (1656): *Disputatio inter Faustum Socinum Senensem et Christianum Francken de honore Christi, id est, utrum Christus, cum ipse perfectissima ratione Deus non sit, religiosa tamen adoratione colendus sit nec ne*, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera Omnia*, II, pp. 767–777.

Francken, Christian (2008): *Disputatio inter theologum et philosophum de incertitudine religionis Christianae*, in Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 151–182.

Francken, Christian (2008): *Spectrum diurnum Genii Christiani Francken apparens malo Simonis Simonii Genio*, in Simon 2008, *Die Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 184–203.

Francken, Christian (2014): *Opere a stampa*, ed. by Mario Biagioni, with an introduction by Gianni Paganini, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Gentili, Alberigo (1589): *De jure belli commentationes tres*, Londini: apud Johannem Wolfium.

Górski (Gorscius), Jakob (1585): *Pro tremenda et veneranda Trinitate adversus quendam apostatam Francken, falso appellatum Christianum, Apologeticus sive Antichristianus*, Coloniae: apud Maternum Cholinum.

Grosse Johann, Gleditsch Johann Friedrich (eds.) (1683): *Acta eruditorum anno 1683 publicata*, Leipzig: typis Christophori Güntheri.

Grosse Johann, Gleditsch Johann Friedrich (eds.) (1686): *Acta eruditorum anno 1686 publicata*, Leipzig: typis Christophori Güntheri.

Grosse Johann, Gleditsch Johann Friedrich (eds.) (1693): *Acta eruditorum anno 1693 publicata*, Leipzig: typis Christophori Güntheri.

Herbert of Cherbury, Edward (1645): *De veritate, prout distinguitur a revelatione, a verisimili, a possibili et a falso, cui Operi additi sunt duo alii tractatus: primus De causis errorum, alter De religione laici; una cum appendice ad sacerdotes de religione laici et quibusdam poematibus*, London: [s.n.].

Hoornbeeck, Johannes (1650): *Apparatus ad controversias et disputationes Socinianas*, Ultrajecti: ex officina Johanni a Waesberge.

Huber, Samuel (1590): *Theses Christum Iesum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum, contra novum, horrendum atque intolerabilem quorundam Calvinistarum errorem, quo ad perpetuo nominis Christiani opprobrium atque dedecus, Christianae religionis atque pietatis fundamentum, aliquot libellis intra triennium evulgatis, evertere conatur*, Tubingae: Gruppenbach.

Hunnius Aegidius, Leyser Polycarp, Gessner Salomon (1594): *Controversiae inter teologos Wittenbergenses de regeneratione et electione dilucida explicatio* [...] *cum refutatione argumentorum quae Dominus Samuel Huberus pro assertione suae opinionis hactenus in medium attulit*, Francofurti: Johannes Spiess.

Hunnius, Nikolaus (1622): *Christliche Betrachtung der newen Paracelsischen und Weigelianischen Theology*, Wittenberg: Johann Korman.

Ittig, Thomas (1704): *Bösianismus per responsa et testimonia theologorum condmnatus, i.e. M. Johannis Georgii Bösens lehre von der durch den terminum Gratiae peremtorium offt lange vor dem tode geendigten Gnaden-Zeit*, Leipzig: Lanckisch.

La Mothe le Vayer, François de (1716): *Cincq dialogues faits à l'imitation des anciens par Oratius Tubero*, Francfort: Jean Savius.

La Mothe le Vayer, François de (1716): *Dialogue traitant de la philosophie sceptique*, in La Mothe Le Vayer 1716, *Cincq dialogues*, t. 1, pp. 1–83.

La Mothe le Vayer, François de (2015): *Dialogues faits à l'imitation des Anciens*, ed. by Bruno Roche, Paris: Champion.

Łaski, Jan (1555): *Forma ac ratio tota ecclesiastici ministerii in peregrinorum potissimum vero Germanorum Ecclesia instituta Londini in Anglia* [...] *anno post Christum natum 1550*, [Emden]: [Egenolff and van der Erve].

Le Mire (Miraeus), Aubert (1649): *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica, sive de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis qui ab anno Christi, quo Ioannes Trithemius desinit, ad usque tempora nostra floruerunt, pars altera*, Antwerpiae: Jacob Mesens (Mesius).

Limborch, Philippus van (1586): *Theologia Christiana, ad praxin pietatis ac promotionem pacis Christianae unice directa*, Amstelodami: apud Henricum Wetstenium.

Locke, John (1695): *The Reasonableness of Christianity. As delivered in the Scriptures*, London: printed for Awnsham and John Churchill.

Locke, John (1707): *A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians. To which is prefixed an Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by consulting St. Paul himself*, London: printed for Awnsham and John Churchill.

Locke, John (1976): *La ragionevolezza del Cristianesimo*, ed. by Alfredo Sabetti, Florence: Nuova Italia.

Locke, John (1979): *Scritti filosofici e religiosi*, ed. by Mario Sina, Milano: Rusconi.

Locke, John (1987): *A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St Paul, to the Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians*, 2 vols., ed. by Arthur W. Wainwright, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Locke, John (1999): *The Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures*, ed. by John C. Higgins-Biddle, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Locke, John (2002): *Essays on the Law of Nature and associated writings*, ed. by Wolfgang von Leyden, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Locke, John (2002): *Writings on religion*, ed. by Victor Nuovo, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Masen, Iacobus (1672): *Utilis curiositas de humanae vitae felicitate, per varios hominum status cum amoeno historiarum aliquot delectu*, Coloniae Agrippinae: Friess.

Micraelius, Johann (1644): *Syntagma historiarum Ecclesiae omnium, in quo piorum aeque ac impiorum coetus, ab initio mundi ad haec usque tempora, compendiosa methodo describuntur*, Stetini: Georgius Rhetius.

Micraelius, Johann (1647): *Ethnophronii contra Gentiles de principiis religionis Christianae dubitationes, Liber tertius: De religione animam immortalem ad Deum aeternamque beatitudinem perducente*, Stetini: typis heredum Georgii Rhetii.

Montaigne, Michel de (1962): *Oeuvres completes*, ed. by Albert Thibaudet and Maurice Rat, Paris: Gallimard.

More, Thomas (1518): *De optimo reipublicae statu deque nova insula Utopia libellus vere aureus nec minus salutaris quam festivus*, Basileae: apud Frobenium.

More, Thomas (1971): *Utopia*, ed. by Luigi Firpo, Torino: UTET.

Müller, Johann Joachim (1999): *De imposturis religionum* (*De tribus impostoribus*). *Von den Betrügereyen der Religionen*, ed. by Winfried Schröder, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holsboog.

Ochino, Bernardino (1542): *Prediche*, [Gèneve]: [Jean Girard].

Ochino, Bernardino (1549): *A tragoedie or dialoge of the uniuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome and of all the iust abolishing of the same, made by master Barnardine Ochine an Italian, and translated out of Latine into Englishe by master John Ponet Doctor of Divinitie, never printed before in any language*, [London]: [N. Hill].

Ochino, Bernardino (1561): *Disputa* [...] *intorno alla presenza del corpo di Giesù Christo nel Sacramento della Cena*, Basilea: [Perna].

Ochino, Bernardino (1561): *Prediche* [...] *nomate laberinti del libero, o ver servo arbitrio, prescienza, predestinazione, et libertà divina et del modo per uscirne. Non mai per l'indietro stampate*, Basileae: [Perna].

Ochino, Bernardino (1562): *La quinta parte delle prediche* [...], *non mai prima stampate, con la sua tavola degli articoli et capi che in quelle si contengono*, Basilea: [Perna].

Ochino, Bernardino (1563): *Dialogi xxx in duos libros divisi, quorum primus est de Messia, continetque dialogos xviii; secundus est cum de rebus variis, tum potissimum de Trinitate, quorum argumenta in secunda utriusque libri pagina invenies*, Basileae: Perna.

Ochino, Bernardino (1985): *I "Dialoghi sette" e altri scritti del tempo della fuga*, ed. by Ugo Rozzo, Torino: Claudiana.

Ochino, Bernardino (2004): *Laberinti del libero arbitrio*, ed. by Marco Bracali, Firenze: Olschki.

Origen Adamantius (1536): *Opera quae quidem extant omnia, per Desiderium Erasmum Roterodamum partim versa, et vigilanter recognita* [...], Basileae: Froben.

Osiander, Lucas (1593): *Refutatio scripti Satanici a Francisco Puccio Filidino in lucem editi, Goudae impressi anno salutis 1592*, Tubingae: Gruppenbach.

Osiander, Lucas (1603): *Epitomes Historiae Ecclesiasticae Centuriae XVI, pars altera*, Tubingae: Gruppenbach.

Pfanner, Tobias (1679): *Systema theologiae gentilis purioris, qua quam prope ad veram religionem Gentiles accesserint, per cuncta fere eius capita, ex ipsis praecipue illorum scriptis ostenduntur*, Basileae: impensis Johannis Hermanni Widerholdi.

Poiret, Pierre (1702): *Irenicum Universale, oder Gewissens-Ruhe aller Frommen Hertzen: Begriffen in einer kurtzen Unterrichtung der christlichen Lehre und insonderheit des Articuls vom Heiligen Abendmahl*, Amsterdam: Theodor Boeteman.

Poiret, Pierre (1707): *Fides et ratio collatae ac suo utroque loco redditae, adversus principia Joannis Lockii*, Amstelaedami, ex officina Wetsteniana.

Pucci, Francesco (1580): *Informatione della religione cristiana, fondata su la divina e humana ragione, secondo che la natura et la scrittura ci insegna*, [London]: [John Wolf].

Pucci, Francesco (1592): *De Christi servatoris efficacitate in omnibus et singulis hominibus, quatenus homines sunt, assertio catholica aequitati divinae et humanae consentanea* [...], Goudae: typis Zassenii Hoenii.

Pucci, Francesco (1955–1959): *Lettere, documenti e testimonianze*, ed. by Luigi Firpo and Renato Piattoli, 2 vols., Firenze: Olschki.

Pucci, Francesco (2000): *De praedestinatione*, ed. by Mario Biagioni, Firenze: Olschki.

Reszka, Stanisław (Rescius) (1596): *De Atheismis et Phalarismis Evangelicorum libri duo, quorum prior de fide, posterior tractat de operibus eorum*, Neapoli: apud Ioannem Iacobum Carlinum et Antonium Pacem.

Schmid, Johann (1714): *Puccium in naturalistis et indifferentistis redivivum*, Leipzig: Zeidler.

Serarius, Nicolas (1593): *Contra novos novi Pelagiani et chiliastae Francisci Puccii Filidini errores, quos sese in Anglia, Gallia, Hollandia, Helvetia et alibi multis probasse gloriatur, quosque per Germaniam peregrinando, colloquendo, suosque de Christi servatoris efficacitate libellos dissipando, spargere incipit, libri duo*, Wirceburgi: ex officina typographica Georgii Fleischmanni.

Sextus Empiricus (1569): *Adversus mathematicos, hoc est adversus eos qui profitentur disciplinas*, Gentiano Herveto Aurelio interprete, Antverpiae: ex officina Christophori Plantini.

Sherlock, William (1652): *A practical discourse concerning future Judgment, second edition*, London: W. Rogers.

Simler, Iosias (1563): *Oratio de vita et obitu carissimi viri et praestantissimi theologi Domini Petri Martyris Vermilii divinarum literarum professoris in schola Tigurina*, Tiguri: apud Christophorum Froschoverum Iuniorem.

Sozzini, Fausto (1656): *Explicatio primae partis primi capitis Evangelistae Johannis*, in Sozzini 1656, *Opera*, I, pp. 75–85.

Sozzini, Fausto (1656): *Opera Omnia in duos tomos distincta*, 2 vols., Irenopoli [Amsterdam]: [Philalethes].

Sozzini, Fausto (2004): *Opera Omnia in duos tomos distincta*, 2 vols., with an introduction and summaries by Emanela Scribano, Siena: Giuseppe Giaccheri Editore.

Sozzini, Fausto (2004): *Rime*, ed. by Emanuela Scribano, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Sozzini Fausto, Pucci Francesco (2010): *De statu primi hominis ante lapsum disputatio*, ed. by Mario Biagioni, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Sozzini, Lelio (1986): *Brevis explicatio in primum Iohannis caput (1561?)*, in Sozzini 1986, *Opere*, pp. 101–128.

Sozzini, Lelio (1986): *Opere*, ed. by Antonio Rotondò, Firenze: Olschki.

Thomasius, Christian (1697): *Problema iuridicum an haeresis sit crimen?*, Halle: Salfeldius.

Tribbechovius, Adam (1700): *Historia Naturalismi a prima sua origine ad nostra usque tempora per suas classes deducta et ex manuscriptis nunc primum edita cura et studio M. Johannis Tribbechovii filii*, Jenae: Bielckius.

Ursinus, Johannes Henricus (1661): *De Zoroastre Bactriano, Hermete Trismegisto, Sanchoniathone Phoenicio eorumque scriptis et aliis contra Mosaicae scripturae antiquitatem, Exercitationes familiares*, Norimbergae: Endterus.

Valdés, Juan de (1994): *Alfabeto cristiano*, ed. by Massimo Firpo, Torino: Einaudi.

Valencia, Gregorio de (1586): *Libri quinque de Trinitate, in quorum postremo nominatim refutantur horribiles blasphemiae cuiusdam pestilentis libri non ita pridem de eodem argumento in Polonia editi*, Ingolstadii: ex officina typographica Davidis Sartorii.

Varsevicius, Christophorus (1584): *Apologia. Huic praemissa est Nicolai Regii Germani, quae eius Apologiae causa fuit, epistola*, Vilnae.

Vermigli, Pietro Martire (1576): *Loci Communes ex variis ipsius authoris et libris in unum volumen collecti et in quatuor classes distribuiti*, Londini: ex typographia Joannis Kingstoni.

Viret, Pierre (1564): *Exposition de la doctrine de la foy chrestienne*, Géneve: Jean Rivery.

Voetius, Gisbertus (1655): *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum, pars secunda*, Ultrajecti: Johannes Waesbergius.

Völkel, Johannes (1630): *De vera religione libri quinque, quibus praefixus est Iohannis Crellii Franci Liber de Deo et eius attributis, ita ut unum cum illis opus constituat*, Racoviae: typis Sebastiani Sternacii.

Wolzogen, Johannes Ludovicus (2012): *Annotationes in meditationes metaphysicas Renati Des Cartis*, ed. by Elisa Angelini, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Secondary Literature

Adam, Gottfried (1970): *Der Streit um die Prädestination im ausgehenden 16. Jahrundert. Eine Untersuchung zu den Entwürfen von Samuel Huber und Aegidius Hunnius*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Addante, Luca (2010): *Eretici e libertini nel Cinquecento italiano*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Addante, Luca (2013): *Giampaolo Alciati della Motta e gli eretici piemontesi nell'Europa del '500*, Torino: Aragno.

Addante, Luca (2014): *Valentino Gentile e il dissenso religioso nel Cinquecento. Dalla Riforma italiana al radicalismo europeo*, Pisa: Edizioni della Normale.

Adorni-Braccesi, Simonetta (1994): *"Una città infetta". La repubblica di Lucca nella crisi religiosa del Cinquecento*, Firenze: Olschki.

Alberico Gentili (*San Ginesio 1552–Londra 1608*)*: atti dei convegni nel quarto centenario della morte* (2010): 2 vols., Milano: Giuffrè Editore.

Alberico Gentili: giurista e intellettuale globale: atti del convegno per la prima giornata gentiliana (1988): Milano: Giuffrè.

Alberigo, Giuseppe (1961): *Andreasi Marsilio*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 3, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Backus, Irena, Büttgen, Philippe, Pouderon Bernard (eds.) (2012): *L'argument hérésiologique. L'église ancienne et les réformers, XVI–XVII^e siecles*, Paris: Beauchesne Editeur.

Backus, Irena, Goudriaan Aza (2012): *"Semipelagianism": the origins of the term and its passage into history of heresy*, "Journal of ecclesiastical history", 63, pp. 1–22.

Bainton, Roland H. (1931): *Sebastian Castellio and the Toleration Controversy of the Sixteenth Century*, in *Persecution* 1931, pp. 183–209.

Bainton, Roland H. (1937): *David Joris, Wiedertäufer und Kämpfer für Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig: Heinsius.

Bainton, Roland H. (1940): *Bernardino Ochino esule e riformatore senese del Cinquecento, 1487–1563*, ed. by Elio Gianturco, Firenze: Sansoni.

Bainton, Roland H. (1941): *The Left Wing of the Reformation*, "The Journal of Religion", vol. 21, n. 2, pp. 124–134.

Bainton, Roland H. (1953): *Hunted heretic. The life and death of Michael Servetus (1511–1553)*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Bainton, Roland H. (1958): *La Riforma Protestante*, Torino: Einaudi.

Bainton, Roland H. (1963): *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, Boston: The Beacon Press (1st ed. Boston 1952).

Bainton, Roland H. (1969): *Erasmus of Christendom*, New York: Scribner.

Bainton, Roland H. (1970): *Erasmo della Cristianità*, Firenze: Sansoni.

Barnavi Élie, Eliav-Feldon Miriam (1988): *Le périple de Francesco Pucci. Utopie, hérésie et vérité religieuse dans la Renaissance tardive*, Paris: Hachette.

Baumann, Michael (2013): *Petrus Martyr Vermigli in Zürich (1556–1562): Reformator, Glaubensflüchtling, Diplomat und Hochschullherer,* Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Belligni, Eleonora (2008): *Evangelismo, Riforma ginevrina e nicodemismo. L'esperienza religiosa di Renata di Francia*, Rende: Brenner Editore.

Bender, Harold Stauffer (1944): *The Anabaptist vision*, Scottdale (PA): Herald Press.

Benedict Philiph, Seidel Menchi Silvana, Tallon Alain (eds.) (2007): *La Réforme en France et en Italie*, Rome: Publications de l'École françoise de Rome.

Benrath, Karl (1875): *Bernardino Ochino von Siena. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformation*, Leipzig: Flues.

Benzoni, Gino (1983): *Jacopo Corbinelli*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 28, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Bernier Marc-André, Charles Sébastien (eds.) (2005): *Scepticisme et modernité*, Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint Etienne.

Berti, Silvia (2012): *Anticristianesimo e libertà. Studi sull'illuminismo radicale europeo*, Bologna: Società Editrice Il Mulino.

Berti Silvia, François Charles-Daubert, Richard Popkin (eds.) (1996): *Heterodoxy, Spinozism and Free Thought in Early Eighteenth Century Europe. Studies on the Traité des Trois Imposteurs*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Biagioni, Mario (1995): *Prospettive di ricerca su Francesco Pucci*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », I, pp. 133–152.

Biagioni, Mario (1999): *Incontri italo-svizzeri nell'Europa del tardo Cinquecento. Francesco Pucci e Samuel Huber*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », CXI, pp. 363–422.

Biagioni, Mario (2000): *Introduzione*, in Pucci 2000, *De praedestinatione*, pp. 1–45.

Biagioni, Mario (2005): *La ragione dell'immortalità: la disputa tra Francesco Pucci e Fausto Sozzini 'De statu primi hominis ante lapsum'*, in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus and his Heritage*, pp. 53–89.

Biagioni, Mario (2007): *L'uomo come "un Dio terrestre": il problema dell'immortalità di Adamo da Francesco Pucci a John Locke. Ipotesi di un percorso*, « Historia philosophica », 5, pp. 159–69. Also in digitalized version: *Hasard et Providence XIV^e–XVII^e siècles. Actes du cinquantenaire de la fondation du CESR et XLIX^e Colloque International d'Études Humanistes. Tours, 3–9 juillet 2006*, publié par le Centre d'Études Supérieures de la Renaissance: http://umr6576.cesr.univ-tours.fr/publications/HasardetProvidence/fichiers/pdf/Biagioni.pdf

Biagioni, Mario (2010): *Christian Francken e le origini cinquecentesche del trattato "De tribus impostoribus"*, « Bruniana & Campanelliana », XVI, 1, pp. 237–246.

Biagioni, Mario (2011): *Francesco Pucci e l'Informatione della religione cristiana*, Torino: Claudiana.

Biagioni, Mario (2013): *Christian Francken sceptical: a reply to József Simon*, « Bruniana & Campanelliana », XIX, 1, pp. 179–182.

Biagioni, Mario (2014): *Christian Francken e la crisi intellettuale della Riforma*, in Francken (2014): *Opere a stampa*, pp. 1–150.

Biagioni Mario, Duni Matteo, Felici Lucia (eds.) (2011): *Fratelli d'Italia. Riformatori italiani nel Cinquecento*, Torino: Claudiana.

Biagioni Mario, Felici Lucia (2012): *La riforma radicale nell'Europa del Cinquecento*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Biasiori, Lucio (2010): *L'eretico e i selvaggi. Celio Secondo Curione, le "amplissime regioni del mondo appena scoperto" e "l'ampiezza del regno di Dio"*, « Bruniana e Campanelliana », XVI, 2, pp. 371–388.

Biasiori, Lucio (2011): *Eretici della chiesa, della patria e della razza. Una reazione cattolico-fascista agli scritti ereticali di Delio Cantimori*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », CXXIII, 2, pp. 622–633.

Bietenholz, Peter (2000): *How Sebastian Franck taught Erasmus to speak with his radical voice*, « Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance », 62, pp. 233–248.

Bietenholz, Peter (2004): *Erasmus en het zeventiende-eeuwse antitrinitarisme: het gewal Daniel Zwicker en Daniel de Breen*, « Doopsgezinde Bijdragen nieuwe reeks », 30, pp. 193–124.

Bietenholz, Peter (2005): *Un guerriero della pace: Sebastian Franck e il suo "Krieg Buechlin des Friedes,"* in Secchi Tarugi (ed.) 2005, *Guerra e pace*, pp. 637–645.

Bietenholz, Peter (2007): *Felicitas* (*eudaimonia*) *ou les promenades d'Érasme dans les jardin d'Épicure*, « Renaissance et Reformation », 30, n. 1, pp. 37–86.

Bietenholz, Peter G. (1971): *Basle and France in the sixteenth century. The Basle humanists and printers in their contacts with Francophone culture*, Genève: Droz.

Bietenholz, Peter G. (1997): *Daniel Zwicker 1612–1678. Peace, tolerance and God the one and only*, Firenze: Olschki.

Bietenholz, Peter G. (2005): *Fausto Sozzini and the new testament scholarship of Erasmus*, in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*, pp. 11–28.

Bietenholz, Peter G. (2009): *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus. Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Biondi, Albano (1974): *Eresia e riforma nell'Italia del Cinquecento, Miscellana I*, ed. by Antonio Rotondò, Firenze-Chicago: Sansoni-The Newberry Library.

Biondi, Albano (1974): *La giustificazione della simulazione nel Cinquecento*, in Biondi 1974, *Eresia*, pp. 5–68.

Blumenberg, Hans (1983): *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, translated by Robert M. Wallace, Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Boros, Gábor (ed.) (2005): *Der Einfluss des Hellenismus auf die Philosophie der Frühen Neuzeit*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Borrelli, Gianfranco (1986): *Tecniche di simulazione e conservazione politica in Gerolamo Cardano e Alberico Gentili*, « Annali dell'Istituto storico Italo-Germanico in Trento », XII, pp. 87–124.

Bracali, Marco (2004): *Simmetria e ordine nei "Laberinti" di Ochino*, in Ochino 2004, *Laberinti*, pp. VII–LXXXIII.

Brady jr. Thomas A., Oberman Heiko A., Tracy James D. (eds) (1995): *Handbook of European History, 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols, Leiden: Brill.

Brundin, Abigail (2008): *Vittoria Colonna and the Spiritual Poetics of the Italian Renaissance*, Ashgate: Aldershot.

Bucciantini, Massimo (2015): *Campo dei Fiori. Storia di un monumento maledetto*, Torino, Einaudi.

Buisson, Ferdinand (1892): *Sébastien Castellion sa vie et son oeuvre* (*1515–1563*). *Étude sur les origines du protestantisme libéral français*, vols. 2, Paris: Hachette.

Butler, Arthur John (ed.) (1904): *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign series of reign of Elizabeth*, XIV, 1579–1580, London: printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office by Mackie.

Caccamo, Domenico (1972): *Bruto Gian Michele*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 14, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Caccamo, Domenico (1999): *Eretici italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania* (*1558–1611*), Firenze: Le Lettere (first edition 1970, Firenze: Sansoni).

Camaioni, Michele (2013): *Nel segno di Bernardino Ochino. Note su Bainton, Cantimori e Benedetto Nicolini*, « Annali dell'Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici », XXVII, pp. 743–832.

Campi, Emidio (1994): *Michelangelo e Vittoria Colonna. Un dialogo artistico-teologico ispirato da Bernardino Ochino*, Torino: Claudiana.

Campi, Emidio (1994): *Remarques sur l'Histoire de la Réforme en Italie*, « Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance », 56, pp. 495–507.

Campi, Emidio (2003): *Pietro Martire Vermigli: influenze europee di un riformatore italiano*, in Olivieri / Bolognesi (eds.), *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, pp. 13–35.

Campi, Emidio (2004): *The Preces sacrae of Peter Martyr Vermigli*, in James III (ed.) 2004, *Peter Martyr Vermigli*, pp. 251–256.

Campi, Emidio (ed.) (2002): *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, Genéve: Droz.

Campi Emidio, James Frank A. III, Kirby Torrance (eds.) (2009): *A companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Cantimori, Delio (1929): *Bernardino Ochino, uomo del rinascimento e riformatore*, « Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa », 30, 1, Pisa, Mariotti, 1929.

Cantimori, Delio (1939): *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento*, Firenze: Sansoni.

Cantimori, Delio (1960): *Prospettive di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento*, Bari: Laterza.

Cantimori, Delio (1992): *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento e Prospettive di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento*, ed. by Adriano Prosperi, Torino: Einaudi.

Cantimori Delio, Feist Hirsch Elisabeth (eds.) (1937): *Per la storia degli eretici italiani del secolo XVI in Europa*, Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia.

Cantù, Cesare (1865): *Gli eretici d'Italia: discorsi storici*, 3 voll., Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice.

Caponetto, Salvatore (1997): *La Riforma protestante nell'Italia del Cinquecento* (2nd ed.), Torino: Claudiana.

Caravale, Giorgio (2007): *Da Firenze a Parigi. L'eretico Francesco Pucci nella Francia delle guerre di religione*, in *La Réforme en France*, pp. 263–280.

Caravale, Giorgio (2011): *Il profeta disarmato. L'eresia di Francesco Pucci nell'Europa del Cinquecento*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Caravale, Giorgio (2015): *The Italian Reformation outside Italy. Francesco Pucci's Heresy in Sixteenth-Century Europe*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Carta, Paolo (1999): *Nunziature ed eresia nel Cinquecento. Nuovi documenti sul processo e la condanna di Francesco Pucci (1592–1597)*, Padova: Cedam.

Carta, Paolo (2008): *Francesco Guicciardini tra diritto e politica*, Padova: Cedam.

Carta, Paolo (2012): *Il "nostro allievo" Francesco Pucci. Nuove ricerche e testimonianze*, « Bruniana & Campanelliana », XVIII, pp. 233–242.

Cavazza, Silvano (2006): *Bonomo, Vergerio, Trubar: propaganda protestante per terre di frontiera*, in Hofer (ed.) 2006, *La gloria*, pp. 91–157.

Cavazza, Silvano (2013): *Libri luterani verso il Friuli: Vergerio, Trubar, Flacio*, in *Venezia e il Friuli*, pp. 31–55.

Chmaj, Ludwik (1963): *Faust Socyn (1539–1604)*, Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Ciliberto, Michele (2007): *Giordano Bruno. Il teatro della vita*, Milano: Mondadori.

Clennell, William H. (2002): *Bodley before the Bodleian*, "Bodleian Library Record", XVII, pp. 371–384.

Cloulas, Ivan (ed.) (1970): *Correspondance du nonce en France Anselmo Dandino (1578–1581)*, Rome-Paris: Boccard.

Collett, Barry (1985): *Italian Benedictine Scholars and the Reformation: the Congregation of Santa Giustina in Padua*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dall'Olio, Guido (2010): *Giulio da Milano*, in *Dizionario Storico dell'Inquisizione*, directed by Adriano prosperi, with the collaboration of Vincenzo Lavenia and John Tedeschi, vol. II, p. 713, Edizioni della Normale: Pisa.

Dán Róbert, Pirnát Antal (eds.) (1982): *Antitrinitarianism in the second half of the 16th Century*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

D'Ascia, Luca (2002): *L'ombra di Valla. La formazione "laica" di un genio religioso del Cinquecento*, in Erasmus 2002, *Antibarbari*, pp. 7–76.

D'Ascia, Luca (2003): *Frontiere. Erasmo da Rotterdam, Celio Secondo Curione, Giordano Bruno*, Bologna: Pendragon.

Del Col, Andrea (1978): *Lucio Paolo Rosello e la vita religiosa veneziana verso la metà del secolo xvi*, « Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia », XXXII, pp. 422–459.

Deppermann Klaus, Packull Werner, Stayer James (1975): *From Monogenesis to Polygenesis: the Historical Discussion of Anabaptist Origin*, "Mennonite Quarterly Review", 49, pp. 83–121.

Diamanti, Alfredo (2010): *Libertas philosophandi. Teologia e filosofia nella lettera alla granduchessa Cristina di Lorena di Galileo Galilei*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Dibon, Paul (ed.) (1959): *Pierre Bayle: le philosophe de Rotterdam*, Amsterdam-Paris: Elsevier-Vrin.

Domingo de Santa Teresa (1957): *Juan de Valdés (1498?–1541): su pensamiento religioso y les Corrientes espirituales de su tiempo*, Romae: apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae.

Donnelly P. John, Kingdon R. M. (1990): *A Bibliography of the works of Peter Martyr Vermigli*, Kirksville (Mo): Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers.

Eliav-Feldon, Miriam (1982): *Realistic Utopias. The Ideal Imaginary Societies of the Renaissance 1516–1630*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Encyclopedia of Women in the Renaissance. Italy, France, and England (2007): ed. by Diane Robin, Anne R. Larsen, Carol Levin, Santa Barbara-Denver-Oxford: ABC-CLIO.

Ernst, Germana (1991): *Religione, ragione e natura. Ricerche su Tommaso Campanella e il tardo Rinascimento*, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Ernst, Germana (2005): *"Sicut amator insaniens." Su Pucci e Campanella*, in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*, pp. 91–112.

Ernst, Germana (2006): *"Un extraordinaire roman bibliographique." In margine al « De tribus impostoribus »*, in Anonymous 2006, *I tre impostori*, pp. 5–27.

Felici, Lucia (2010): *Giovanni Calvino e l'Italia*, Torino: Claudiana.

Firpo, Luigi (1949): *Processo e morte di Francesco Pucci*, « Rivista di Filosofia », XI, pp. 371–405 (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 17–51).

Firpo, Luigi (1952): *John Dee, scienziato, negromante e avventuriero*, « Rinascimento », 3, pp. 25–84.

Firpo, Luigi (1955): *Francesco Pucci a Basilea*, in *Medioevo e Rinascimento. Studi in onore di Bruno Nardi*, 2 vols., Florence: Sansoni, I, pp. 257–295 (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 67–96).

Firpo, Luigi (1957): *Gli scritti di Francesco Pucci*, in *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Parte seconda, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche,* 3rd series, 4, pp. 195–368.

Firpo, Luigi (1958): *Il vero autore di un celebre scritto antitrinitario: Christian Francken a non Lelio Socino*, « Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi », LXXVII, pp. 51–68 (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 96–115).

Firpo, Luigi (1960): *Christian Francken antitrinitario*, « Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi », LXXVIII, pp. 27–35 (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 195–204).

Firpo, Luigi (1967): *Nuove ricerche su Francesco Pucci*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXIX, pp. 1053–1074 (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 207–232).

Firpo, Luigi (1979): *Castelvetro Giacomo*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 22, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana (now in Firpo 1996, *Scritti*, pp. 237–242).

Firpo, Luigi (1996): *Scritti sulla Riforma in Italia*, Napoli: Prismi.

Firpo, Luigi (1998): *Il processo di Giordano Bruno*, ed. by Diego Quaglioni, Roma: Salerno Editrice.

Firpo, Luigi (ed.)(1971): *Introduzione*, in More 1971, *Utopia*, pp. 7–22.

Firpo, Massimo (1973): *Pierre Bayle. Gli eretici italiani del Cinquecento e la tradizione sociniana*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXXV, pp. 612–666.

Firpo, Massimo (1980): *John Locke e il socinianesimo*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », XCII, pp. 35–124.

Firpo, Massimo (1990): *Tra alumbrados e "spirituali." Studi su Juan de Valdés e il valdesianesimo nella crisi religiosa del '500 italiano*, Firenze: Olschki.

Firpo, Massimo (1993): *Riforma protestante ed eresie nell'Italia del Cinquecento: un profilo storico*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Firpo, Massimo (1998): *Dal sacco di Roma all'inquisizione. Studi su Juan del Valdés e la Riforma italiana*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Firpo, Massimo (2001): *"Boni Christiani merito vocantur haeretici." Bernardino Ochino e la tolleranza*, in *La formazione storica*, I, pp. 161–244.

Firpo, Massimo (2005): *Inquisizione romana e Controriforma. Studi sul cardinal Giovanni Morone (1509–1580) e il suo processo d'eresia*, Brescia: Morcelliana.

Firpo, Massimo (2006): *Vittore Soranzo vescovo ed eretico. Riforma della Chiesa e Inquisizione nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Firpo, Massimo (2014): *La presa di potere dell'Inquisizione romana 1550–1553*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Firpo, Massimo (2015): *Juan de Valdés and the Italian Reformation*, translated by Richard Bates, Farnham-Burlington: Ashgate.

Firpo, Massimo (2016): *Juan de Valdès e la Riforma nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Firpo Massimo, Marcatto Dario (eds.) (1981–1995): *Il processo inquisitoriale del cardinal Giovanni Morone*, 6 vol., Roma: Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea.

Firpo Massimo, Marcatto Dario. (eds.) (1998): *I processi inquisitori ali di Pietro Carnesecchi (1557–1567)*, 3 voll., Città del Vaticano: Archivio Segreto Vaticano.

Friesen, Abraham (1998): *Erasmus, the Anabaptists and the Great Commission*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge: William B. Eermands Publishing Company.

Gascon, Richard (1971): *Grand commerce et vie urbaine au XVI^e siècle. Lyon et ses marchands*, 2 vols., Paris-La Haye: Mouton.

Gericke, Wolfgang (1982): *Das Buch « De Tribus Impostoribus »*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Gilly, Carlos (1977–1979): *Zwischen Erfahrung und Spekulation. Theodor Zwinger und die religiöse und culturelle krise seiner zeit*, « Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde », LXXVII, pp. 57–137; LXXIX, pp. 125–223.

Gilly, Carlos (2005): *Erasmo, la Reforma radical y los heterodoxos radicales españoles*, in Martinez Romero 2005, *Les Lletres*, pp. 225–376.

Ginzburg, Carlo (1963): *Balbani Niccolò*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 5, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Ginzburg, Carlo (1970): *Il nicodemismo. Simulazione e dissimulazione religiosa nell'Europa del '500*, Torino: Einaudi.

Giordano Bruno e la Francia (2009): Atti della giornata di studi. Verona, 19 aprile 2007, ed. by Rosanna Gorris Camos, with an introduction by Davide Bigalli, Roma: Vecchiarelli.

Giuntini, Chiara (2005): *Il corpo immortale: filosofia e teologia nell'ultimo Locke*, « Rivista di filosofia », XCVI, pp. 187–215.

Gleason, Elisabeth G. (1978): *On the Nature of the Sixteenth-Century Italian Evangelism: Scholarship, 1953–1978*, "The Sixteenth Century Journal", vol. 9, n. 3 (Autumn, 1978), pp. 3–26.

Gliozzi, Giuliano (1977): *Adamo e il nuovo mondo. La nascita dell'antropologia come ideologia coloniale: dalle genealogie bibliche alle teorie razziali (1500–1700)*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Goertz, Hans Jürgen (1987): *Pfaffenhass und gross Geschrei. Die Reformatorischen Bewegungen in Deutschland* (1517–1529), München: C.H. Beck.

Goertz, Hans Jürgen (1989): *Thomas Müntzer. Mystiker, Apokalyptiker, Revolutionär*, München: Beck.

Goertz, Hans Jürgen (1993): *Thomas Müntzer. Apocaliptic Mystic and Revolutionary*, Edinburg: Clark.

Goertz, Hans Jürgen (1995): *Antiklerikalismus und Reformation. Sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Goertz, Hans Jürgen (2007): *Radikalität der Reformation. Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, Vandenhoeck & Göttingen: Ruprecht.

Goertz, Hans Jürgen (ed.) (1982): *Profiles of Radikal Reformers. Biographical Sketches from Thomas Müntzer to Paracelsus*, Kitchener: Herald Press.

Gorfunkel, Alexis (1997): *Notizie Bruniane*, « Rivista di storia della filosofia », n. 4, pp. 747–752.

Gotor, Miguel (2011): *Bernardino Ochino*, in Biagioni / Duni / Felici (eds.) 2011, *Fratelli*, pp. 95–101.

Gotor, Miguel (2013): *Bernardino Ochino*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 79, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Guggisberg, Rudolph (1982): *Basel in the Sixteenth Century. Aspects of the City Republic before, during, and after the Reformation*, St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research.

Hamilton, Alastair (1980): *The Family of Love*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.

Harrison John, Laslett Peter (eds.) (1965): *The library of John Locke*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hegler, Alfred (1892): *Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck. Eine studie zur Geschichte des Spiritualismus in der Reformationszeit*, Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr.

Hermanin Camilla, Simonutti Luisa (eds.) (2011): *La centralità del dubbio. Un progetto di Antonio Rotondò*, 2 voll., Firenze: Olschki.

Hillerbrand, Hans J. (1988): *Radicalism in the Early Reformation: Varieties of Reformation in Church and Society*, in Hillerbrand (ed.) 1988: *Radical Tendencies*, pp. 25–41.

Hillerbrand, Hans J. (ed.) (1988): *Radical tendencies in the Reformation: divergent perspectives*, Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal.

Hofer, Gianfranco (ed.) (2006): *"La Gloria del Signore." La Riforma protestante nell'Italia nord-orientale*, Mariano del Friuli: Edizioni della Laguna.

Huizinga, Johan (1924): *Erasmus*, New York-London: Scribner.

Hunter Michael, Wootton David (eds.) (1992): *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Israel, Jonathan (2002): *Radical Enlightenment: philosophy and the making of modernity (1650–1750)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Israel, Jonathan (2006): *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670–1752*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Israel, Jonathan (2010): *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jacob, Margaret C. (1981): *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*, London-Boston: Allen & Unwin.

James, Frank A. III (1998): *Vermigli and Predestination: the Augustinian Heritage of an Italian Reformer*, Oxford University Press.

James, Frank A. III (ed.) (2004): *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: semper reformanda*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Keserü, Bálint (1982): *Christian Franckens Tätigkeit im ungarischen Sprachgebiet und sein unbekanntes Werk "Disputatio de incertitudine religionis Christianae"* in Dán / Pirnát (eds.) 1982, *Antitrinitarianism*, pp. 73–84.

Kevorkian, Tanya (2007): *Baroque Piety: Religion, Society and Music in Leipzig 1650–1750*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kinder, Gordon A. (1986): *Antonio del Corro*, « Bibliotheca Dissidentium », VII, pp. 121–177. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner.

Koyré, Alexandre (1957): *From the closed World to the infinite universe*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Kołakowski, Leszek (1969): *Chrétiens sans Église. La conscience religieuse et le lien confessionnel au XVII^e siècle*, Paris: Gallimard.

Kurtz, Johann (1885): *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende*, 9th ed., Leipzig: Neumann.

Lacché, Luigi (2009): *"Ius gentium, ius communicationis, ius belli." Alberico Gentili e gli orizzonti della modernità*, Milano: Giuffrè.

La formazione storica della alterità. Studi di storia della tolleranza nell'età moderna offerti a Antonio Rotondò (2001): promoted by H. Méchoulan, R. H. Popkin, G. Ricuperati, L. Simonutti, 3 vols., Firenze: Olschki.

Landucci, Sergio (2014): *I filosofi e i selvaggi*, Torino: Einaudi.

La Réforme en France et en Italie. Contacts, comparaisons et contrastes (2007): ed. by Philiph Benedict, Silvana Seidel Menchi et Alain Tallon, Rome: École Française de Rome.

Laube, Adolf (1988): *Radicalism as a Research Problem in the History of Early Reformation*, in Hillerbrand (ed.) 1988: *Radical Tendencies*, pp. 9–23.

Lavenia, Vincenzo (2009): *Alberico Gentili: i processi, le fedi, la guerra*, in Lacché (ed.) 2009, *Ius gentium*, pp. 167–196.

Lavenia, Vincenzo (ed.) (2015): *Alberico Gentili. "Responsability to protect": nuovi orientamenti su intervento umanitario e ordine internazionale*, Atti del Convegno della XV Giornata Gentiliana, Macerata: Edizioni Università Macerata.

Le Goff, Jacques (2004): *Un long Moyen Âge*, Paris: Tallandier.

Le Goff, Jacques (2014): *Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches?*, [Paris]: Éditions du Seuil, Collection « La Librairie du XXI° siècle ».

Leonard, Émile G. (1971): *Storia del protestantesimo*, 4 vols., Milano: Il Saggiatore.

Lestringant, Franck (1996): *L'experience huguenote au Nouveaux Monde*, Droz: Geneve.

Lestringant, Franck (2005): *Le Brésil de Montaigne. Le Noveau Monde des "Essays" (1580–1592)*, Paris: Chandeigne.

Lestringant, Frank (1990): *Le Huguenot et le sauvage. L'Amérique et la controverse coloniale en France au temps des guerres de religion*, Paris: Aux amateurs des livres.

Lettieri, Gaetano (2013): *Omnipotentia e subiectio: una teologia trinitaria imperiale. Aspetti della polemica anti-ariana nel "De fide" di Ambrogio*, in Passarella (ed.) 2013, *Ambrogio*, pp. 47–78.

Lorenzetti, Roberta (1995): *L'antropologia filosofica di Fausto Sozzini*, Milano: C.U.S.L., pp. 13–71.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. (1964): *The great chain of being. A study of the history of an idea*, Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press (first ed. 1936).

Maia Neto José R., Paganini Gianni, Laursen Christian John (eds.) (2009): *Skepticism in the Modern Age. Building on the Work of Richard Popkin*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Marchetti, Valerio (1969): *Sull'origine e la dispersione del gruppo ereticale dei Sozzini a Siena (1557–1560)*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXXI, pp. 133–173.

Marchetti, Valerio (1974): *Camogli Niccolò*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 17, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Marchetti, Valerio (1975): *Gruppi ereticali senesi del Cinquecento*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Marchetti, Valerio (1975): *Le "Explicationes" giovannee dei Sozzini e l'antitrinitrismo transilvano del Cinquecento*, in Marchetti 1975, Rapporti, pp. 347–359.

Marchetti, Valerio (1975): *Rapporti veneto-ungheresi all'epoca del Rinascimento*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Marchetti, Valerio (1999): *I simulacri delle parole e il lavoro dell'eresia. Ricerca sulle origini del socinianesimo*, CISEC: Bologna.

Marchetti Valerio, Patrizi Giorgio (1979): *Castelvetro Lodovico*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 22, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Marchetti Valerio, Zucchini Giampaolo (eds.) (1982): *Aggiunte all'epistolario di Fausto Sozzini (1561–1568)*, Warszawa-Lodz: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Marshall, John (2000): *Locke, Socinianism 'Socinianism,' and Unitarianism*, in Stewart (ed.) 2000, *English philosophy in the age of Locke*, pp. 111–182.

Martinez Romero, Tomás (ed.) (2005): *Les Lletres hispàniques als siegles* XVI, XVII I XVIII, Castelló de la Plana: Publicacions de la Universidat Jaume I.

Masini, Pier Carlo (1978): *Eresie dell'Ottocento. Alle sorgenti laiche, umaniste e libertarie della democrazia italiana*, Milano: Editoriale Nuova.

Mazzei, Rita (2013): *Per terra e per acqua. Viaggi e viaggiatori nell'Europa moderna*, Firenze: Carocci Editore.

McKenna Antony, Moreau Pierre-François (2010): *Le libertinisme comme catégorie*, in *Le libertinage est-il une catégorie philosophique?*, Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne.

McLaughlin, R. Emmet (2008): *Radicals*, in Whitford 2008, *Reformation and Early Modern Europe*, pp. 80–120.

McLean, Jan (2009): *Alberico Gentili, his publishers, and the vagaries of the book trade between England and Germany* (*1580–1614*), in McLean 2009, *Learning*, pp. 291–337.

McLean, Jan (2009): *Learning and the Market Place: Essays in the History of the Early Modern Book*, Leiden: Brill.

McLelland, Joseph C. (ed.) (1980): *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, Waterloo (Ontario): Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

McNair, Philip (1967): *Peter Martyr in Italy: an anatomy of apostasy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McNair, Philip (1980): *Peter Martyr in England*, in McLelland (ed.) 1980, *Peter Martyr*, pp. 85–105.

Miccoli, Giovanni (1970): *Delio Cantimori. La ricerca di una nuova critica storiografica*, Torino: Einaudi.

Moreau, Pierre-François (ed.) (2001): *Le scepticisme au XVI^e^ et au XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris: A. Michel.

Moriconi, Pierluigi (ed.)(2005): *Caterina Cybo, duchessa di Camerino* (*1501–1557*), Atti del Convegno di Camerino, ottobre 2004, Camerino: La nuova stampa.

Mortimer Sarah, Robertson John (eds.) (2012): *The intellectual consequences of Religious Heterodoxy 1600–1750*, Leiden: Brill.

Movimenti ereticali in Italia e in Polonia nei secoli XVI–XVII (1974): Atti del convegno Italo-polacco, Firenze 22–24 Settembre 1971, Firenze: Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento.

Mulsow, Martin (2002): *Moderne aus dem Untergrund. Radikale Frühaufklarüng in Deutschland* (*1680–1720*), Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag.

Mulsow, Martin (2005): *Samuel Crell—an intellectual profile*, in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*, pp. 477–494.

Mulsow Martin, Rohls John (eds.) (2005): *Socinianism and Arminianism. Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, Leiden: Brill.

Muratori, Cecilia (2011): *La caduta dell'uomo e la sofferenza degli animali nella "Disputatio" tra Francesco Pucci e Fausto Sozzini*, « Bruniana & Campanelliana », XVII, I, pp. 139–149.

Muratori, Cecilia (ed.) (2013): *The Animal Soul and the Human Mind. Renaissance Debates*, Supplementi di « Bruniana & Campanelliana », Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra.

Muratori Cecilia, Dohm Burkhard (eds.) (2013): *Ethical perspectives on animals in the Renaissance and Early Modern period*, Firenze: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo.

Ogonowski, Zbigniew (1966): *Socynianizm a oświecenie: studia nad myśla filozoficzno-religijna arian w Polsce 17.wieku*, Warszawa: Państowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Ogonowski, Zbigniew (1971): *Le rationalisme dans la doctrine des sociniens*, in *Movimenti ereticali* 1974, pp. 141–157.

Ogonowski, Zbigniew (1972): *Locke*, Warszawa: Ksiazka i Wiedza.

Olivieri Achille, Bolognesi Pietro (eds.) (2003): *Pietro Martire Vermigli (1499–1562). Umanista, riformatore, pastore*, Atti del Convegno per il V centenario (Padova, 28–29 ottobre 1999), Roma: Herder Editrice e Libreria.

Ozment, Steven (ed.) (1982): *Reformation Europe: a guide to research*, St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research.

Paganini, Gianni (2008): *Skepsis. Le débat des modernes sur le scepticisme*, Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

Paganini, Gianni (ed.) (2001): *The Return of Scepticism. From Hobbes and Descartes to Bayle*, Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer.

Paganini Gianni, Maia Neto José (eds.) (2009): *Renaissance scepticism*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Panizza, Diego (1970): *Machiavelli e Gentili*, « Il Pensiero Politico », 11, pp. 476–483.

Panizza, Diego (1981): *Alberico Gentili, giurista e ideologo nell'Inghilterra elisabettiana*, Padova: La garangola.

Panizza, Diego (1988): *Alberico Gentili, vicenda umana e intellettuale di un giurista italiano nell'Inghilterra elisabettiana*, in *Alberico Gentili* 1988, pp. 31–58.

Panizza, Diego (ed.) (2002): *Alberico Gentili: politica e religione nell'età delle guerre di religione. Atti del convegno, seconda giornata gentiliana*, Milano: Giuffrè.

Passarella, Raffaele (ed.) (2013): *Ambrogio e l'Arianesimo*, Roma: Bulzoni.

Pastore, Alessandro (ed.) (1991): *Riforma e società nei Grigioni. Valtellina e Valchiavenna tra '500 e '600*, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Pastore, Alessandro (2015): *Nella Valtellina del tardo Cinquecento. Fede, cultura, società*, Viella: Roma.

Pastore, Stefania (2004): *Un'eresia spagnola. Spiritualità conversa, alumbradismo e Inquisizione (1449–1559)*, Firenze: Olschki.

Patrizi, Giorgio (1982): *Colonna Vittoria*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 27, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Perini, Leandro (2002): *La vita e i tempi di Pietro Perna*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Persecution and Liberty. Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr (1931): New York: The Century Co.

Pesce, Mauro (2014): *La relazione tra il concetto di eresia e la storia del Cristianesimo*, « Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi », nr. 1, pp. 151–168.

Pesce, Mauro (2015): *Il conflitto dei simboli. Mondo moderno e cristianesimo*, Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane.

Petermann, Eric (2007): *Die Universität Leipzig und der Pietismus. Die Person August Hermann Francke*, München: Grin Verlag.

Petrucci, Franca (1981): *Cibo Caterina*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 25, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Peyronel Rambaldi, Susanna (2007): *Propaganda evangelica e protestante in Italia (1520–1570)*, in Benedict / Seidel Menchi / Tallon (eds.) 2007, *La Réforme en France*, pp. 53–68.

Pirillo, Diego (2010): *Filosofia ed eresia nell'Inghilterra del tardo Cinquecento. Bruno, Sidney e i dissidenti religiosi italiani*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Pitassi, Maria-Cristina (1990): *Le Philosophe et l'Écriture. John Locke exégète de Saint Paul*, Geneva: Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie.

Pitassi, Maria-Cristina (1992): *"Anima naturaliter mortalis?". L'interpretazione lockiana di* 1 Tessalonicesi 5, 23, « Annali di storia dell'esegesi », 87, pp. 87–99.

Pitassi, Maria-Cristina (1994): *Le Christ lockien à l'epreuve des textes: de la "Reasonableness" aux "Paraphrase and Notes"*, in Pitassi (ed.) 1994: *Le Christ*, pp. 101–122.

Pitassi, Maria-Cristina (ed.) (1994): *Le Christ entre orthodoxie et lumières*, actes du colloque (Genève, Août 1993), Geneva: Droz.

Plath, Uwe (1973): *Calvin und Basel, 1552–1556*, Basel-Stuttgart: Eerdmans.

Pocock, John Greville Agard (1999): *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 1, *The Enlightenment of Edward Gibbon, 1737–1764*, Cambridge: University Press.

Popkin, Richard H. (1959): *Pierre Bayle's place in 17th century scepticism*, in Dibon (ed.) 1959, *Pierre Bayle*, pp. 1–19.

Popkin, Richard H. (2003): *The History of Scepticism from Savonarola to Bayle*, 3rd edition, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press (1st edition, Assen 1960).

Popkin Richard H., Schmitt Charles B. (eds.) (1987): *Scepticism to the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Priarolo Mariangela, Scribano Emanuela (eds.) (2005): *Fausto Sozzini e la filosofia in Europa*, Siena: Accademia senese degli Intronati.

Prosperi, Adriano (1992): *Introduzione*, in Cantimori 1992, *Eretici italiani*, pp. XI–LXII.

Prosperi, Adriano (1996): *Tribunali della coscienza. Inquisitori, confessori, missionari*, Torino: Einaudi.

Prosperi, Adriano (2000): *L'eresia del libro grande. Storia di Giorgio Siculo e della sua setta*, Milano: Feltrinelli.

Prosperi, Adriano (2016): *La vocazione. Storie di gesuiti tra Cinquecento e Seicento*, Torino: Einaudi.

Quaglioni, Diego (2005): *"A ciascuno il suo." Libertà religiosa e sovranità in Francesco Ruffini*, "The Cardozo Electronic Law Bulletin", 11, www.jus.unitn.it/cardozo/Review/home.html.

Quaglioni, Diego (2009): *Il "De papatu Romano Antichristo" del Gentili*, in Lacchè (ed.) 2009, *Ius gentium*, pp. 71–84.

Radetti, Giorgio (1940): *Riformatori ed eretici italiani del secolo XVI*, « Giornale critico della filosofia italiana », XXI, pp. 13–97, 240–267.

Raitt, Jill (1993): *The Colloquy of Montbéliard. Religion and Politics in the Sixteenth Century*, New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rétat, Pierre (ed.) (1973): *Traité des trois imposteurs: manuscrit clandestin au début du 18e siècle* (*ed. 1777*), Saint-Etienne: Èditions de l'Université de Saint-Etienne.

Richter, Mario (1973): *Jean de Sponde e la lingua poetica dei protestanti nel Cinquecento*, Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica.

Roth, John D. (2002): *Recent Currents in the Historiography of the Radical Reformation*, "Church History", LXXI, nr. 3, pp. 523–535.

Rothkegel, Martin (2014): *Paruta Niccolò*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 81, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Rotondò, Antonio (1962): *Per la storia dell'eresia a Bologna nel secolo XVI*, « Rinascimento », II, pp. 107–154 (now in: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, 249–295).

Rotondò, Antonio (1966): *I movimenti ereticali nell'Europa del Cinquecento. Discussione storiografica*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXVIII, pp. 103–139 (now in: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, pp. 1–43).

Rotondò, Antonio (1967): *Atteggiamenti della vita morale italiana del Cinquecento. La pratica nicodemitica*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXIX, pp. 991–1030 (now in: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, pp. 201–247).

Rotondò, Antonio (1968): *Calvino e gli antitrinitari italiani*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXX, pp. 759–784 (now in: Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, I, pp. 297–321).

Rotondò, Antonio (1974): *Il primo soggiorno in Inghilterra e i primi scritti teologici di Francesco Pucci*, in Rotondò 1974, *Studi e ricerche*, pp. 225–271 (now in Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, II, pp. 577–615).

Rotondò, Antonio (1974): *Pietro Perna e la vita culturale e religiosa di Basilea fra il 1570 e il 1580*, in Rotondò 1974, *Studi e ricerche*, pp. 273–391 (now in Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, II, pp. 479–576).

Rotondò, Antonio (1974): *Studi e ricerche di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento*, Torino: Giappichelli.

Rotondò, Antonio (1976): *Esuli italiani in Valtellina nel Cinquecento*, « Rivista Storica Italiana », LXXXVIII, pp. 756–791 (now in Rotondò 2008, *Studi*, II, pp. 403–442).

Rotondò, Antonio (1992): *Europe et Pays-Bas. Evolution, réélaboration et diffusion de la tolérance aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siécles. Lignes d'un programme de recherches*, Firenze: Università degli Studi Dipartimento di Storia.

Rotondò, Antonio (1993): *Alcune considerazioni su "Eretici italiani del Cinquecento"* « Studi Storici », XXXIV, n. 4, pp. 769–775.

Rotondò, Antonio (2008): *Studi di storia ereticale del Cinquecento*, 2 vols, Firenze: Olschki.

Rozzo, Ugo (1989): *Giulio Della Rovere*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 37, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Ruffini, Francesco (1901): *La libertà religiosa. Storia dell'idea*, Torino: Fratelli Bocca Editori.

Ruffini, Francesco (1928): *Il giureconsulto chierese Matteo Gribaldi Mofa e Calvino*, « Rivista di storia del diritto italiano », I, pp. 208–269, 417–432.

Salvadori, Stefania (2009): *Sebastiano Castellione e la ragione della tolleranza. L'*Ars dubitandi *fra conoscenza umana e veritas divina*, Milano: Mimesis.

Salvadori, Stefania (2010): *Il martire e l'eretico. La discussione fra Castellione e Calvino sulla possibilità di errare*, in « Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica », n. 2, pp. 53–64.

Savage, Ruth (ed.) (2012): *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*, Oxford: University Press.

Scapparone, Elisabetta (2009): *"Une religion politique"? Giordano bruno e Jacopo Corbinelli: frammenti di un dialogo*, in *Giordano Bruno* 2009, pp. 59–72.

Schmitt, Charles Bernard (1967): *Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1469–1533) and his critique of Aristotle*, The Hague: Nijhoff.

Schmitt, Charles Bernard (1972): *Cicero scepticus: a study of the influence of the Academia in the Renaissance*, The Hague: Nijhoff.

Scribano, Emanuela (2004): *Introduzione*, in Sozzini 2004, *Opera*, I, pp. IX–XXII.

Scribano, Emanuela (2011): *Angeli e beati. Modelli di conoscenza da Tommaso a Spinoza*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Scribano, Emanuela (2011): *Fausto Sozzini*, in Biagioni / Duni / Felici (eds.) 2011, *Fratelli*, pp. 127–136.

Secchi Tarugi, Luisa (ed.)(2005): *Guerra e pace nel pensiero del Rinascimento*: atti del 15° Convegno internazionale, Chianciano-Pienza, 14–17 luglio 2003, Firenze: Cesati.

Seidel Menchi, Silvana (1987): *Erasmo in Italia 1520–1580*, Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.

Shantz, Douglas H. (2013): *An introduction to German Pietism. Protestant renewal at the dawn of Modern Europe*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Shantz, Douglas H. (ed.) (2015): *A companion to German Pietism, 1660–1800*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Simon, József (2005): *Sed cur nihilo minus athei vocantur?*, in Boros (ed.) 2005, *Der Einfluss*, pp. 181–193.

Simon, József (2008): *Die Religionsphilosophie Christian Franckens (1552–1610?). Atheismus und radikale Reformation im Frühneuzeitlichen Ostmitteleuropa*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Simon, József (2013): *Metaphysical certitude and plurality of religions: Christian Francken and the problem of philosophical libertinism in early modern eastern Europe*, in « Bruniana & Campanelliana », XIX, 1, pp. 165–177.

Simoncelli, Paolo (1979): *Evangelismo italiano del Cinquecento: questione religiosa e nicodemismo politico*, Roma: Istituto Storico per l'Età Moderna e Contemporanea.

Simonutti, Luisa (2005): *Fausto Sozzini, gli arminiani e il socinianesimo nell'Olanda del Seicento*, in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*, pp. 251–283.

Simonutti, Luisa (2005): *John Locke e il socinianesimo*, in Priarolo / Scribano (eds.) 2005, *Fausto Sozzini e la filosofia in Europa*, pp. 211–245.

Sina, Mario (1972): *Testi teologico-filosofici lockiani dal ms. Locke c. 27 della Lovelace Collection*, « Rivista di Filosofia Neoscolastica », LXIV, pp. 54–75, 400–427.

Sina, Mario (1976): *L'avvento della ragione. 'Reason' e 'above Reason' dal razionalismo teologico inglese al deismo*, Milano: Vita e Pensiero.

Skrzypek, Marian (2005): *Une dissertation anonyme française de 1736 sur le socinianisme*, in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*, pp. 467–475.

Spini, Giorgio (1978): *De Atheismis et Phalarismis Evangelicorum di Stanisław Reszka e Atheismus Triumphatus di Tommaso Campanella*, in *Storia e cultura* 1978, pp. 51–76.

Stayer, James (1972): *Anabaptist and the Sword*, Lawrence (Kansas): Coronado Press.

Stayer, James (1982): *The Anabaptists*, in Ozment 1982, *Reformation Europe*, pp. 135–159.

Stayer, James (1995): *The Radical Reformation*, in Brady jr. / Oberman / Tracy (eds.) (1995): *Handbook of European History*, vol. 2, pp. 249–282.

Stella, Aldo (2003): *Pietro Martire Vermigli e gli "eretici" italiani*, in Olivieri / Bolognesi (eds.) 2003, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, pp. 83–90.

Stewart, Michael A. (ed.) (2000): *English philosophy in the age of Locke*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Storia e cultura del Mezzogiorno. Studi in memoria di Umberto Caldora (1978): Cosenza: Edizioni Lerici.

Szczucki, Lech (1964): *Marcin Czechowic: studium z dziejów antytrynitaryzmu polskiego 16.wieku*, Warszawa: Państowe Wydawnichtwo Naukowe.

Szczucki, Lech (1967): *La prima edizione dell'Explicatio di Fausto Sozzini*, « Rinascimento », XVIII, pp. 319–327.

Szczucki, Lech (1972): *W Kręgu myślicieli heretyckirch*, Wroclaw: Polska Akademia Nauk.

Szczucki, Lech (1977): *Philosophie und Autorität. Der Fall Christian Francken*, in Wrzecionko (ed.) 1977, *Reformation*, pp. 157–243

Szczucki, Lech (1993): *Nonconformiści religijni xvi i xvii wieku: studia i szicice*, Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii.

Szczucki, Lech (2005): *Fausto Sozzini in Polonia* (1579–1604), in Szczucki (ed.) 2005, *Faustus Socinus*, pp. 113–128.

Szczucki, Lech (ed.) (2005): *Faustus Socinus and his heritage*, Kraków: Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Tarantino, Giovanni (2000): *Martin Clifford, 1624–1677. Deismo e tolleranza nell'Inghilterra della restaurazione*, Firenze: Olschki.

Tarantino, Giovanni (2012): *Martin Clifford and his "Treatise of humane reason" (1674): a Europe-wide debate*, in Savage 2012, *Philosophy and Religion*, pp. 9–28.

Tazbir, Janusz (1967): *Państwo bez stosów. Szkice z dziejów tolerancji w Polsce w xvi i xvii w.*, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Tazbir, Janusz (1973): *A State without Stakes: Polish Religious Toleration in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, New York: Kościuszko Foundation.

Tazbir, Janusz (1980): *Tradycje tolerancji religijnej w Polsce*, Warszawa: Książka I Wiedza.

Tazbir, Janusz (1996): *Reformacja, Kontrreformacja, Tolerancja: a to Polska właśnie*, Wrocław: Wydawn Dolnośląskie.

Tedeschi, John (1967): *Besozzi Antonio Mario*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 9, Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.

Tedeschi, John (ed.) (2002): *The correspondence of Roland H. Bainton and Delio Cantimori (1932–1966). An enduring transatlantic friendship between two historians or religious toleration*, with an appendix of documents, Firenze: Olschki.

Terpstra, Nicholas (2008): *Italy*, in Withford 2008, *Reformation and Early Modern Europe*, pp. 228–249.

Tracy, James D. (1982): *Humanism and the Reformation*, in Ozment 1982, *Reformation Europe*, pp. 33–57.

Trim, David J. B. (1998): *Sir Thomas Bodley and the international protestant cause*, "Bodleian Library Record", xvii, pp. 314–340.

Troeltsch, Ernst (1912): *Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, Tübingen: Mohr.

Vasoli, Cesare (1996): *Una donna tra il potere e il "Vangelo": Caterina Cibo da Varano*, in Vasoli (1996), *"Civitas mundi"*, pp. 123–138.

Vasoli, Cesare (1996): *"Civitas mundi." Studi sulla cultura del Cinquecento*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura: Roma.

Vasoli, Cesare (2011): *La contestazione delle certezze di Calvino. Il* De Arte Dubitandi *di Sebastiano Castellione*, in Hermanin / Simonutti (eds.) 2011, *La centralità del dubbio*, i, pp. 27–63.

Venezia e il Friuli: la fede e la repressione del dissenso (2013): Montereale Valcellina: Circolo culturale Menocchio.

Visentin, Stefano (1997): *Introduzione*, in Castellio, *La persecuzione*, pp. vii–lxii.

Vuilleumier, Henri (1929): *Histoire de l'église réformée du pays de Vaud sous le régime bernois*, Lausanne: Editions de La Concorde.

Whitford, David M. (ed.) (2008): *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: a guide to research*, Kirksville: Truman State University Press.

Wijaczka, Jacek (1991): *Christian Francken*, « Bibliotheca Dissidentium. Repertoire des non-conformistes religieux des seizième et dix-septième sìecles », ed. by André Séguenny, t. XIII, pp. 95–135, Baden-Baden: Koerner.

Wilbur, Earl Morse (1946–1952): *A history of Unitarianism*, vol. 1: *Socinianism and its antecedents*, vol. 2: *In Transylvania, England and America*, Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

Williams, George Huntston (1962): *The Radical Reformation*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Williams George Huntston, Mergal Angel M. (eds.) (1957): *Spiritual and anabaptist writers. Documents illustrative of the Radical Reformation*, Philadelphia.

Wolff, Christoph (2000): *Johann Sebastian Bach. The learned musician*, New York: Norton & Company.

Wrzecionko, Paul (ed.) (1977): *Reformation un Frühaufklärung in Polen. Studien über den Sozinianismus und seine Einfluß auf das westeuropäische Denken im 17. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Yates, Frances A. (2006): *Giordano Bruno e la cultura europea del Rinascimento*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Zuidema, Jason (2015): *Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499–1562) and the Outward Instruments of Divine Grace*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Index of Names

Abraham 131
Aconcio, Jacopo 1, 39, 50
Acquaviva d'Aragona, Ottavio, cardinal 117, 118
Adam x, 23, 56, 57–60, 62, 64–69, 71–75, 77n, 84, 90, 98, 131, 141
Adam, Gottfried 22n, 82n
Addante, Luca 14, 29n, 42n, 43n
Adelung, Johann Christoph 117
Adorni-Braccesi, Simonetta 30n, 34n, 35
Agrippa von Nettesheim, Heinrich Cornelius 119n, 125
Alamanni, Ludovico 43
Alba, Julia 112
Alberigo, Giuseppe 81n
Alciati, Giampaolo 43
Alciati, Giovanni Paolo 137
Aldobrandini, Ippolito, cardinal 84
Altdorf 109, 110, 115
Amboise 42
Ambrose, saint 138
Amerbach, Basilius 30
Amerbach, Bonifacius 19, 29, 30
America 8
Amerio, Romano 85
Ammannati, Bartolomeo 44
Ammannati, Niccolò 44n
Amsterdam 69, 98
Andreae, Jakob 82
Andreasi, Marsilio 81, 92
Anguillara, Giovanni Andrea dell' 44
Anne of Brittany 37n
Anselm of Aosta 122
Antwerp 55
Aquinas, Thomas, saint 114, 122, 124
Arias Montano, Benito 55
Aristotle 115, 119–122
Arminius, Jacobus 94
Arnold, Gottfried viii, 101, 103
Augsburg 37
Augustine of Hippo, saint 83, 86
Austerlitz *see* Slavkov u Brna
Austria 49
Avicenna 122

Bach, Johann Sebastian 102n
Backus, Irena 5, 6n
Bahuin, Jean 30
Baillet, Adrien 99, 102
Bainton, Roland H. 1, 2n, 6–8, 12, 13, 15, 32n, 37n, 137
Balbani, Matteo 43
Balbani, Niccolò 30, 86
Barclay, Robert 100, 105
Bargagli, Girolamo 41, 43–46
Barlaeus, Caspar 105
Barnavi, Élie 48n, 49, 54n, 55n, 87n, 91n
Basalù, Giulio 14, 16
Basel x, 1, 2n, 17, 20, 23, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 43, 45, 49, 50, 52, 65, 66, 80, 81n, 84, 86, 89, 92, 109, 110, 135, 138, 139
Báthory, Sigismund, prince of Transylvania 112
Battiferri, Laura 44
Baumann, Michael 39n
Bayle, Pierre 79n, 99, 100, 142
Becmann, Christoph 117
Belleville 88
Belligni, Eleonora 37n
Bembo, Pietro 36n
Bender, Harold Stauffer 7, 8, 10, 11
Benrath, Karl 36n, 39n
Benzoni, Gino 29n
Bern 22, 81, 82
Bernier, Marc-André 108n
Berti, Silvia 23, 24
Besozzi, Antonio Maria 43, 45
Betti, Francesco 39, 43, 46, 50, 52, 138
Bèze, Théodore de 21, 38, 43, 44, 82, 83, 86
Biagioni, Giorgio xi
Biagioni, Mario 22n, 49n, 51n, 52n, 54n, 55n, 65–68, 71n, 82n, 86n, 88n, 109n, 110n, 112n, 115n, 120n, 125n, 127n, 129n, 133n, 138n, 140n
Biandrata, Giorgio 30, 40, 137
Biasiori, Lucio 4n, 77n
Biddle, John 63
Bietenholz, Peter 16, 24, 30n, 91
Biondi, Albano 13, 46n
Blumenberg, Hans 90, 91n
Boccaccio, Giovanni 45
Bock, Friedrich Samuel 70n
Bodin, Jean 97, 104

Bodley, Thomas 50–52
Bologna 13, 41, 46
Bolognesi, Pietro 32n
Bolsec, Jérôme 81
Bonifacio, Bernardino 1
Bonomo, Pietro 21n
Borrelli, Gianfranco 51n
Borrhaus, Martin 9
Böse, Johann Georg 101, 102
Boston 6
Bourignon, Antoinette 100, 105
Boyle, Robert 60
Bracali, Marco 39n
Brahe, Ticho 87
Brazil 68, 77n
Breen, Daniel de 16
Brescia 81n
Bronzino, Agnolo 44n
Brundin, Abigail 36n
Bruno, Giordano x, 4, 49, 76–79, 83–92, 125
Bruto, Michele 43
Bucciantini, Massimo 4n
Bucer, Martin 33, 36
Buisson, Ferdinand 39n
Bulgarini, Belisario 66n
Bullinger, Heinrich 7, 19, 20, 31, 33, 36, 38, 40, 43n
Buonarroti, Michelangelo 36n
Buoninsegni family 42
Burckhardt, Jacob 2
Busale, Girolamo 14
Butler, Arthur John 53n
Büttgen, Philippe 6n

Caccamo, Domenico 13n, 31n, 43n
Calixtus, Georg 98
Calovius, Abraham 98
Calvin, John 6, 19, 21, 23, 30, 33, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43n, 80–82, 85, 92, 93, 121, 133, 135, 136, 139
Camaioni, Michele 32n
Cambridge 73
Camogli, Niccolò 43
Campanella, Tommaso 60, 79n, 84, 85, 100, 127, 128
Campi, Emidio 21, 22, 32–39
Cantimori, Delio 1–3, 4n, 5n, 6, 9, 11–13, 15, 18, 19, 22, 29n, 32n, 39n, 42n, 43n, 45n, 47n, 48, 53, 63n
Cantù, Cesare 3
Capacci, Pier Luigi 44
Capito, Wolfgang 36
Caponetto, Salvatore 30n, 37n
Cappellini, Benedetta xi
Capponi, Cappone 43
Carafa, Gian Pietro (later Paolo IV pope) 29, 34, 35
Caravale, Giorgio 29n, 43n, 54n, 55n, 82n, 89n
Cardano, Girolamo 16
Carducci, Giosuè 4n
Carnesecchi, Pietro 20, 32, 33, 36n
Caro, Annibale 44, 45
Carpzov, Johann Benedict II 101, 102
Carpzov, Samuel Benedict 101
Carta, Paolo 29n, 49n, 52–55, 89n
Castelli, Benedetto 76
Castellio, Sebastian 1, 5, 6, 15–17, 22, 23, 30, 38, 39, 45, 80, 92, 105, 114n, 115, 124, 135, 137, 138
Castelnau, Michel de 78n
Castelvetro, Jacopo 50, 52
Castelvetro, Ludovico 44, 45, 47, 50
Castiglione, Baldassarre 36n
Castiglione, Guarnerio 46
Cavazza, Silvano 21n
Cecil, William 53
Celestino da Verona 85
Cellini, Benvenuto 44n
Celsi, Mino 1
Charles-Daubert, Françoise 23
Charles, Sébastien 108n
Charles V, emperor 34, 37
Charlewood, John 78n
Charondas 119
Charron, Pierre 108
Chauvinus, Petrus 104
Chmaj, Ludwik 12, 41n, 42n
Chrysostom, John, saint 91n
Cicero, Marcus Tullius 23n, 108n
Ciliberto, Michele 87, 89–91
Cinuzzi family 42
Cinuzzi, Marcantonio 41, 44
Claudiopolis 117
Clemente VIII, pope 84, 95
Clennel, William H. 50n
Clifford, Martin 104, 105n
Cloulas, Ivan 50–52
Cluj 109, 112, 117
Cobban, Henry 53

Colberg, Ehregott Daniel 100, 101
Collett, Barry 34n
Colonna, Vittoria 36
Contarini, Gasparo 28, 32, 35
Corbinelli, Jacopo 29n, 50, 52, 88, 89, 91
Corinth 43
Corro, Antonio del 14
Cosimo I de' Medici, grand duke of Tuscany 41, 46
Courcelles, Étienne de 104
Cox, Richard 52
Crafftheim, Crato von 19
Cranmer, Thomas 37, 38
Crell, Johannes x, 63, 70, 71, 73, 141
Crell, Samuel x, 63, 71, 72
Cristina di Lorena, grand duchess of Tuscany 76
Critias of Athens 116, 123, 132
Culverwell, Nathaniel 73
Curione, Celio Secondo 1, 9, 16, 20, 23, 30, 59, 80, 81, 92, 137, 139
Cusanus, Nicolaus *see* Nicholas of Cusa
Cybo, Caterina 35
Czechowic, Marcin 12

Dall'Olio, Guido 35n
Dandino, Anselmo 50, 52
D'Ascia, Luca 20n, 91, 93n
Dávid, Ferenc 40, 48, 111
Dee, John 112
De Gaspari, Giovanni Battista 102n
Del Bene, Piero 88
Del Col, Andrea 21n
Delia *see* Spannocchi, Virginia Della Rovere, Giulio 35
Democritus 122
Denck, Hans 7
Den Haag 93n
De Poort, Henricus Nicolaus van 105
Deppermann, Klaus 11n
De Silvestris, Matteo 85
Descartes, René 99, 100, 104, 142
Diagoras of Melos 116, 123
Diamanti, Alfredo 76n
Diogenes 116
Dion 116
Dippel, Johann Conrad 105
Dolce, Ludovico 44
Dohm, Burkhard 90n
Domingo de Santa Teresa 33n
Doni, Agostino 17
Donne, John 76
Donnelly, John P. 32n
Duby, George vii
Dudith, Andreas 12, 53, 87, 110, 111, 114
Dudley, Robert 78
Dufour, Alain 21, 22
Duni, Matteo xi
Duns Scotus, John 122, 124
Du Jon (Junius), François 94, 98, 115n, 126

Edwards, John 57
Egeria, nymph 131
Eijnatten, Joris van 24
Eliav-Feldon, Miriam 48, 49, 54n, 55n, 87n, 91n
Elizabeth I, queen of England and Ireland 37
Ely 52
Emilia Romagna 4
Empedocles 122
England ix, 8, 37, 49–55, 78n, 79, 84, 86, 89, 90n, 93n, 136, 142, 143
Epictetus 112, 120n
Epicurus 123
Episcopius, Simon 104
Erasmus of Rotterdam vii, ix–xi, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 28–30, 33, 59, 81, 82, 91–93, 108, 115, 125
Ercole II d'Este 37n
Ernst, Germana xi, 126n, 127n, 129
Essex 57
Estienne, Robert (Robertus Stephanus) 125
Euhemerus 116, 123
Europe vii–x, 2, 3, 8, 10–14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27–32, 49–53, 56, 77, 79, 80, 83, 86, 92–94, 106, 109, 126, 127, 135, 136, 138, 142, 143
Eve 141

Farel, Guillaume 38
Farnese, Alessandro, cardinal 35
Feist, Elisabeth 5n
Felici, Lucia xi, 21, 37n
Ferentilli, Agostino 46, 47n
Ferrara 37, 52
Ficino, Marsilio 128
Fiesole 36
Filipów 68
Filmer, Robert 72n

Firpo, Luigi x, 5, 27n, 43n, 48–51, 53, 54, 65n, 68n, 81n, 83–87, 91n, 93n, 95n, 112n, 118n, 127n, 138n
Firpo, Massimo 14, 20, 22, 23, 29n, 32n, 35n, 37–39, 62n, 65, 99n
Flaminio, Marco Antonio 32
Flanders 84
Florence 2, 6, 12n, 13, 31n, 32, 35, 36n, 44n, 89n, 143
Florenius, Paul 110
Fossombrone 112, 115
France 6, 30n, 42, 50, 59, 84, 90n, 136, 137, 142
Francesco I de' Medici, grand duke of Tuscany 47
Franchi, Giuseppe 44
Francke, August Hermann 101
Francken, Christian xi, 5, 12, 25, 108–134, 137, 139, 141
Frankfurt viii, 52, 93–95
Franck, Sebastian 16
Freigius, Thomas 115
Friesen, Abraham 15, 16n
Froben, Johann 28n, 30

Galilei, Galileo 76
Galli, Tolomeo 50, 52
Gardelegen 109
Gascon, Richard 42n
Geneva 14, 20–22, 29–31, 37, 38, 42, 43, 80–82, 84, 109, 135
Genova 43
Gentile, Giovanni 2
Gentile, Valentino 29, 30, 42, 43, 137
Gentili, Alberico 50n, 51
Gent, William 93n
Gerendi, János 111
Gericke, Wolfgang 129
Germany ix, 2, 6, 11, 12, 18, 22, 31, 36n, 49, 56, 84, 90n, 94, 95, 100, 103, 136
Gessner, Salomon 95–97
Giannone, Pietro 17
Giberti, Gian Matteo 32, 35
Gilly, Carlos 16, 28n, 30n, 92n
Ginzburg, Carlo 13, 30n, 46n
Giova, Giuseppe 43
Giulio da Milano, *see* Della Rovere, Giulio Giulio da Salò 85
Giunti printers 49
Giuntini, Chiara 58
Gleason, Elisabeth G. 28n
Gleditsch, Johann Friedrich 104n, 105n
Gliozzi, Giuliano 77n
Goertz, Hans Jürgen 9–11
Gondi, Francesco Maria 52
Gondi, Leonardo 52
Gorfunkel, Alexis 89n, 90n
Górski (Gorscius), Jakob 115n, 127n
Gotor, Miguel 32n, 33n, 37n
Gouda 3, 67, 84, 93
Goudriaan, Aza 6n
Gow, Andrew Colin xi
Graziano, Francesco 85
Grebel, Conrad 11
Gregory of Rimini 33
Greifswald 100
Gribaldi Mofa, Matteo 30, 137
Groningen 63n
Grosse, Johann 104n, 105n
Gruppenbach, Georg 94
Guggisberg, Rudolph 30n
Guicciardini, Francesco 29n, 89n
Guidiccioni, Bartolomeo 35

Hajeck, Tadeas 87
Halle 101
Haller, Johann 38, 81
Hamburg 129
Hamilton, Alastair 55n
Harrison, John 63n, 64n, 72n
Hegler, Alfred 7
Heidelberg 126
Helmstadt 31
Henningius, Jacobus 117
Henry III, king of France 88
Henry IV of Navarra, king of France 84, 86, 88
Herbert of Cherbury, Edward 100, 104
Herdesianus, Christoph 40
Hermanin, Camilla 24n
Hervet, Gentian 125
Higgins-Biddle, John C. 72
Hillerbrand, Hans J. 7, 11n
Hobbes, Thomas 17, 100, 104
Hoffmann, Melchior 11
Holland 67
Hoornbeeck, Johannes 99
Huber, Samuel 82, 93–95
Hubmaier, Balthasar 7

Huber, Samuel 22, 94, 96, 106
Huizinga, Johann 15
Hungary 12
Hunnius, Aegidius 82, 93, 95–97, 100
Hunnius, Nicolaus 97
Hunter, Michael 23
Hut, Hans 11
Hutton, Sarah 24

Ignatius of Loyola, saint 112
Innocenzo X, pope 31
Isaac 131
Isabella de' Medici 46, 47n
Israel 120, 121
Israel, Jonathan 18, 106n, 140, 142
Isselt, Michael van 93
Italy 3, 4, 6, 13, 20, 21, 22, 29, 34–37, 41, 44, 46, 47, 49–51, 80n, 81, 84, 92–94, 110, 136
Ittig, Thomas 101, 102, 105

Jacob 131
Jacob, Margaret C. 106n
James, Frank A. III 32n
Japan 130
Jena 100
Jerome, saint 91n
Jerusalem 37
Jesus Christ 3, 22, 28, 33, 34, 36, 38, 44, 49, 53, 58–62, 64–68, 70–75, 77, 82, 83, 86, 87n, 89, 90, 93–98, 100–104, 107, 108, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 118, 128, 130n, 132, 138, 141
John Chrysostom, saint 34
John the Evangelist 19, 40, 45
John II Casimir Vasa, king of Poland 31
Joris, David 6, 15, 23, 30

Kappel 31
Karlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von 12
Kelley, Edward 112
Keserü, Bálint 116n, 117n
Kevorkian, Tanya 101n
Kiel 129
Kinder, Gordon A. 14n
Kingdom, R. M. 32n
Kirby, Torrance 32n
Kołakowski, Leszek 12, 19
Köln 53n
Kot, Stanisław 12
Koyré, Alexandre 76, 78, 79
Krakow x, 24n, 31, 40, 41, 53, 56, 65, 68, 69n, 84, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 127
Kurtz, Johann 8

Labadie, Jean de 98
La Mothe Le Vayer, François de 105, 108, 141
Landucci, Sergio 129, 140, 142
LaPeyrère, Isaac 71, 79n
Łaski, Jan 53n
Laslett, Peter 63n, 64n, 72n
Laube, Adolf 9–11
Laureto, Giovanni 14
Laursen, Christian John 108n
Lausanne 20, 22
Lavenia, Vincenzo 51n
Le Clerc, Jean 60
Le Goff, Jacques vii, 142n
Leiden 94
Leipzig 6, 100–102, 108, 110
Le Mire (Miraeus), Aubert 128
Lenzoni, Francesco 87
Lestringant, Franck 77n
Lettieri, Gaetano 138n
Leyser, Polycarp 95–97
Limborch, Philipp van 60, 104
Lipenius, Martin 117
Lipsius, Justus 55
Lismanini, Francesco 39
Lithuania 68
Locarno 38
Locke, John x, 16, 25, 57, 58–66, 72–75, 137, 141
London 14, 29, 37, 49–51, 78, 79, 84, 86, 89, 104n, 143
Lorenzetti, Roberta 66n
Lorenzino de' Medici 89
Loreto 121
Louis XII, king of France 37n
Louvain 27, 28n, 29
Lovejoy, Arthur 77
Low Countries 11, 137n, 139n
Lucca 29, 30, 34–36, 43, 44
Lucretius, Titus Carus 78
Luke the evangelist 60n
Lusławice 41
Luther, Martin 6, 7, 21, 27, 28, 33, 40, 85, 93, 95, 108, 136, 137, 143
Lycurgus 119, 131
Lyon 29, 42–44, 50–52

Machiavelli, Niccolò 51n
Magdeburg 109
Maia Neto, José R. 23, 24n, 108n
Mainz 84
Mantua 46
Marbach, Johann 110
Marburg 84
Marcatto, Dario 20n, 35n
Marchetti, Valerio 40–46
Maresius, Samuel 63n
Marshall, John 62n
Mary I, queen of England and Ireland 38
Masen, Jacob 104
Masham family 57
Masini, Pier Carlo 4n
Mazzei, Rita 29n
Mazzini, Giuseppe 4n
McKenna, Antony 26n
McLaughlin, Robert Emmet 12
McLean, Jan 50n
McNair, Philip 32–34, 36n, 38n
Medici family 47, 88
Melanchthon, Philip 7, 33
Mergal, Angel M. 7n
Miccoli, Giovanni 2n
Micraelius, Joannes (Lütkeschwager) 97–99
Milan 43, 112
Milton, John 16
Minos 119, 131
Minutoli, Paolino 43
Mocenigo, Giovanni 85, 86
Modena 35, 50
Montaigne, Michel de 77, 125
Montbéliard 82, 95
Moravia 32, 40, 126, 136
Moreau, Pierre-François 26n, 108n
More, Thomas 27, 28
Moriconi, Pierluigi 35n
Morone, Giovanni 20, 28, 35
Morsztyn, Elisabeth 48
Morsztyn, Krzysztof 111
Mortimer, Sarah 17
Morus, Saracenus 112, 115–118, 121, 124, 125
Moses 70n, 131
Moskorzewski, Hieronim 64, 65, 68n
Muhammad 119, 131
Müller, Johann Joachim 129
Mulsow, Martin 18, 71n
Müntzer, Thomas 7, 10, 12
Muratori, Cecilia 23n, 90n
Musculus, Wolfgang 82
Muzzarelli, Girolamo 41
Myconius, Oswald 36

Naples 28, 33–35, 91n, 110
Netherlands 55n, 56, 84, 93, 136, 142
Newton, Isaac 16, 142
New York 6
Nicholas of Cusa 77, 78, 120
Noah 96
Numa Pompilius 119, 131
Nuovo, Victor 58
Nuremberg 94, 109, 110
Nye, Stephen 73n

Oates 57
Ochino, Bernardino x, 1, 2, 6, 9, 15, 23, 30–40, 45, 137
Ogonowski, Zbigniew 12, 63n, 70n
Olearius, Johannes 102
Olivieri, Achille 32n
Olivier-Razali, Séraphin 46
Oporinus, Johannes 30
Orange 58
Origen 81, 85, 92
Orsini, Paolo Giordano 46, 47n
Ortelius, Adam 55
Osiander, Lucas 94–96, 98, 99
Osius, Stanislaus 126
Ostrorog, Johann 115
Oxford 14, 29, 38, 49, 78, 84
Ozment, Steven 13

Packull, Werner 11n
Padua 33, 52, 88
Paganini, Gianni 23, 24n, 108n
Palaeologus, Jacob 12
Panizza, Diego 51n
Paolo III, pope 34, 35
Paolo IV, pope 28, 35
Pappus, Johannes 110
Paris 29, 50–52, 84, 88–90, 143
Paruta, Niccolò 40
Pastore, Alessandro 30n
Pastore, Stefania 81n
Patin, Guy 127

Patrizi, Giorgio 36n
Paul of Tarsus, apostle 43, 57, 74, 120
Pawlickowice 111
Pedro Álvarez de Toledo, viceroy of Naples 34
Pellikan, Konrad 19, 36, 39
Perna, Pietro 30, 39, 110, 138
Pesce, Mauro 5, 138n
Petermann, Eric 101n
Peter, saint 117
Petersen, Johann Wilhelm 105
Petrarca, Francesco 42
Petrucci, Franca 35
Peyronel Rambaldi, Susanna 21n
Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 92
Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni Francesco 108n, 125
Pigghe, Albert 81
Pinczów 40
Pinelli, Gian Vincenzo 88, 89
Pirillo, Diego 79n
Pisa 1
Pitassi, Maria-Cristina 58n, 59n, 62n
Plantin, Christophe 55, 94
Plath, Uwe 30n Plato 36, 122
Pocock, John 17
Poiret, Pierre 105
Poland ix, 6, 8, 12, 31, 32, 40, 41, 43, 48, 109, 111, 113, 115, 126, 136, 142
Pole, Reginald 28, 36n, 110, 125
Pomponazzi, Pietro 78, 119n, 128
Popkin, Richard Henry 23, 24, 99, 106, 108, 125, 139
Popple, William 73n
Poschiavo 80n
Postel, Guillaume 15
Pouderon, Bernard 6n
Prague x, 56, 83–87, 90, 94, 109, 112
Priarolo, Mariangela 24n
Prodicus 116, 123
Prosperi, Adriano 2n, 4, 13, 20, 81n, 109n
Protagoras 116, 123
Provana, Prospero 31
Psannerus, Tobias 99
Pucci, Francesco ix, x, 2, 5, 9, 22, 23, 25, 29, 31, 43n, 48–56, 59, 65–69, 74, 76, 82–100, 102–107, 112, 127, 133, 137, 138, 140, 143
Pucci, Giovanni 31n
Pythagoras 131

Quaglioni, Diego 3n, 51n

Radecke, Matthew 55n, 98, 100
Radetti, Giorgio 54
Raitt, Jill 82n
Raków 31, 64, 68n
Ramus, Petrus 110, 115
Rechenberg, Adam 101
Reina, Cassiodoro de 14
Reineccius, Christian 101, 102
Renée of France, duchess of Ferrara 37
Reszka (Rescius), Stanisław 126, 127
Rétat, Pierre 127n
Richter, Mario 44n
Ricuperati, Giuseppe 24
Rinuccini family 29
Robertson, John 17
Rohls, John 18n
Rome x, 4, 28, 32–38, 43, 46, 52, 56, 67, 78, 83, 84, 93, 95, 96, 106, 110–112, 114, 115, 125, 127, 128
Rosello, Lucio Paolo 21n
Roth, John D. 7n, 8n, 11
Rothkegel, Martin 40n
Rotondò, Antonio ix, 2, 3n, 9, 13n, 15, 18, 19, 21n, 24, 30n, 40n, 46n, 49n, 81n, 92n, 110n, 137n, 139n
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 140
Rozzo, Ugo 35n
Rudolph II of Austria, emperor 84, 87
Ruffini, Francesco 3
Russi 4n
Rustici, Filippo 43

Sabetti, Alfredo 62n
Sadoleto, Jacopo 28, 125
Saitta, Giuseppe 2
Salvadori, Stefania 22, 114n, 135n
Salzburg 56, 95n
Sanchez, Francisco 125
Sassetti, Giovanni Battista 52
Saxony 109
Scala, Dario 43
Scapparone, Elisabetta 88n, 89n
Schlichting, Jonas 53
Schmalz, Valentin 41, 64
Schmid, Johann 102–106
Schmitt, Charles Bernard 23, 24, 108
Schröder, Winfried 129

Scribano, Emanuela xi, 24, 41n, 47, 114n
Séguenny, André 19
Seidel Menchi, Silvana 20, 81n
Serarius, Nicolas 89, 90, 94, 98
Servetus, Michael 6, 14–17, 20, 30, 38, 80, 92, 109, 133, 135, 139
Seville 14
Sextus Empiricus 108, 112, 116, 122–125, 132
Shantz, Douglas H. 101n
Sherlock, William 105
Siculo, Giorgio 13, 20, 59, 81
Sidney, sir Philip 49, 51, 79
Siena 24n, 29, 32, 41–43, 45–47
Sigismund III Vasa, king of Poland 31
Simler, Josias 33
Simoncelli, Paolo 13n, 28n
Simon, József 109n, 112n, 116–126, 129–133
Simon, Richard 76
Simoni, Simone 128
Simons, Menno 15
Simonutti, Luisa 24n, 59n, 60n, 62n, 63n, 73n
Sina, Mario 57n, 63n, 73n, 114n
Sisto V, pope 88
Skarga, Piotr 112, 116
Skrzypek, Marian 69n
Slavkov u Brna 32, 40
Sloane, sir Hans 53
Socrates 121, 122
Solon 119, 131
Soranzo, Vittore 20
Sozzini, Agnese 48
Sozzini, Camillo 41, 42, 46, 50
Sozzini, Celso 41
Sozzini, Cornelio 41, 42
Sozzini family 42, 43
Sozzini, Fausto x, 1, 12, 16, 17, 23–25, 29, 31, 40–47, 50, 53, 55, 56, 62–70, 73, 74, 84, 90, 98–100, 111, 113, 114, 126n, 133, 137, 138, 141, 142
Sozzini, Fillide 47
Sozzini, Lelio 1, 16, 19, 23, 30, 31, 38, 40, 43, 45–47
Sozzini, Mariano 41
Spain 6, 14, 28, 79, 81, 88n, 136
Spannocchi family 42
Spannocchi, Niccolò 41
Spannocchi, Virginia 42, 44, 46, 47
Speciano, Cesare 112
Spini, Giorgio 126n
Spinoza, Baruch 17, 18, 104, 140, 142
Stancari, Andrea 46
Stayer, James 10–12, 20, 21n
Stella, Aldo 40n
Stilpon of Megara 116
Stoiński, Piotr 64
Strasbourg 19, 36, 37, 110
Straube, Paul 128
Stuttgart 53n
Switzerland ix, 2, 20, 22, 30, 31, 40, 46, 80n, 81, 94, 109, 136
Szczecin 97
Szczucki, Lech x, 12, 24n, 40n, 41n, 109n, 112n, 117–119

Tarantino, Giovanni 105n
Tasso, Bernardo 44
Tazbir, Janusz 12
Tedeschi, John 1n, 2n, 4n, 24, 43n
Terpstra, Nicholas 13
Thomasius, Christian 6
Tizzano, Lorenzo 14
Tomasius, Jakob 102
Toulouse 89
Tournon, François de 42
Tracy, James D. 13n
Transylvania ix, 8, 31, 40, 47, 109, 111, 115, 126, 136
Trent 28, 58
Tribbechovius, Adam 100, 103
Tribbechovius, Johannes 100
Trim, David J. B. 50n
Troeltsch, Ernst 7
Trubar, Primož 21n
Tübingen 22, 82, 83, 94, 95
Turin x, 6
Tuscany 87
Tyszkiewicz, Iwan 31

Udine 85
Urbino 44n
Ursinus, Johannes Henricus 79n

Vaia, Francesco 85
Valchiavenna 30
Valdés, Juan de 14, 28, 32–34, 36n
Valencia, Gregorio de 115n
Valencia, Pedro de 125

Valera, Cipriano de 14
Valla, Lorenzo 1, 93n
Valtellina 30
Vasoli, Cesare 13n, 35n, 114n
Vaud 81
Vels, Anselm von 112
Venice 13, 33, 35, 43, 52, 84
Vergerio, Pietro Paolo 21n
Vermigli, Pietro Martire x, 30, 32, 34–40
Verona 35
Versé, Noël Aubert de 142
Vettori, Piero 44n
Vico, Giambattista 17
Vienna 110, 111, 114, 128
Vietnam 1
Villafranca, Juan de 14
Viret, Pierre 37n, 43
Visentin, Stefano 80n
Voetius, Gisbertus 99, 100
Völkel, Johannes x, 63, 64, 68–70
Vuilleumier, Henri 81n

Waad, William 53
Wacker, Matthaeus 87
Walsingham, Francis 52
Warsaw 31
Warszewicki, Krzysztof 111, 119
Węgrów 111
Weigel, Valentin 97
Werdenhagen, Johann Angelius 105
Westphal, Joachim 38
Whichcote, Benjamin 73
Whitford, David M. 12, 13, 15, 16n
Wiesbaden 84
Wijaczka, Jacek 109n
Wilbur, Earl Morse 8
William of Ockham 122
Williams, George Huntston 7–11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 136
Wittenberg 22, 82, 84, 93, 95, 97
Wolf, Johannes 19
Wolf, John 49–51
Wolff, Christoph 102n
Wolzogen, Johann Ludwig 63, 142
Wootton, David 23
Wrocław 53, 87, 109, 110
Wtenbogaert, Johann 94
Wujek, Jakob 63n
Württemberg 94
Würzburg 89, 94

Yates, Frances A. 88n, 91

Zaleucus 119
Zanchi, Girolamo 30
Zébédée, Andrée 81
Zion 31
Zoroaster 79n, 119, 131
Zucchini, Giampaolo 42–46
Zuidema, Jason 32n
Zurich 1, 11, 20, 21, 30–33, 36, 38, 40, 43, 45, 53n
Zwicker, Daniel 16
Zwinger, Theodor 30
Zwingli, Huldrich 7, 21, 31, 33, 136